THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THERE are some hard sayings in Scripture which preachers and theologians have neither been able to agree about nor yet to leave alone. One of these, and by no means the least important, is our Lord's so-called ' cry of dereliction ' on the Cross. Some discussion of it is included in one of the best short books on the Passion and particularly on the seven words from the Cross that it has been our fortune to meet—*The Passion of the King*.[1] The writer is a New Testament scholar of repute, Dr. FREDERICK C. GRANT of Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Let it be said at once that Dr. GRANT will have none of the familiar theory that the words, ' My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me ? ' were wrung from Christ because He was so identified with the sin of the world that the Father who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity had to avert His gaze from the sin-bearing Son. These words are, as has often been noticed, a quotation from the twenty-second Psalm. They point to the high probability that the whole Psalm was in our Lord's mind as He hung on the Cross ; and in any case no pious Jew who in the hour of death was overheard reciting one of the Psalms would be supposed to be thinking that God had forsaken him. Moreover, the very fact that the words quoted are addressed to God would seem to indicate that the speaker was assured that he was being heard and that God had not turned away in disgust or wrath. In this special case is it conceivable that the Father would abandon the Son precisely at the time when the Son was fulfilling the Father's will to the uttermost ?

Dr. GRANT, however, is not content to leave the matter there. He proceeds to examine the evidence for the last few minutes of our Lord's earthly life and to show that the interpretation which depicts His dying with a cry of despair on His lips is really a misconstruction.

It must be remembered that that cry, which is stated to have been uttered ' with a loud voice,' was not the last cry. The Fourth Gospel records a later cry, ' It is finished,' and Mark also declares that ' Jesus uttered a loud cry, and breathed his last ' (Mk 15^{37} R.S.V.). It was when the centurion ' saw that He thus breathed His last ' that he exclaimed, ' Truly this man was a son of God.' Some manuscripts of the New Testament, followed by the Authorised Version, have it, ' When the centurion . . . saw that He thus cried out and breathed His last,' and the word used for crying out is a strong word. It is used earlier in the same chapter for the repeated shout of the Jerusalem crowd ' Crucify him.' It means not the despairing sob of a victim, but the roaring shout of a victor in battle. The same is true of the Greek words used in all manuscripts of Mk 15^{37} quoted above. To say even ' uttered a loud cry ' is too mild a phrase. ' A great shout ' would be a better rendering. That is what impressed the centurion. A warrior himself, he knew a shout of victory when he heard it. ' It was no cry of despair,' says Dr. GRANT, ' that won from a pagan centurion in charge of Christ's execution that word of praise which no pagan could outbid : " Surely this man was a son of God "—like Heracles, like Asclepius, like the Dioscuri, a divine being who endured toils upon earth for the sake of men, and won out, in the end, victoriously, even over death itself. We miss the whole point of Mark's tremendous climax if we becloud the story with our antiquated and impossible—and entirely unnecessary—theological fiction of the " cry " of " dereliction." '

If this Psalm was in truth running through our Lord's mind as He hung on the Cross, we may surmise what it meant to Him. While the first twenty-one verses speak of persecution and shame and make complaining appeals for deliverance, it is a strong confidence in God that rings through the remainder of the Psalm. He has heard, He will hear and He will save. Further, our Lord may well have found in these verses light on the meaning of His own death ; for at the end it seems clear that God's release of the weary Psalmist—be he individual or the corporate people of God—is what converts outsiders and wins men to the Divine obedience, when all the ends of the earth turn to the Lord and acknowledge that the Kingdom is

[1] Macmillan Company ; 17s. 6d. net.

His and ' He is the governor among the nations.' Almost as clearly as in Is 53 it is the suffering of the righteous Servant of the Lord which shows the nations how wrong they have been and turns them to the true God.

Surely our Lord must have applied these later thoughts of the Psalm and not merely the first verse to His own situation. He had not come to do His own will, but the will of the Father. He had not come to serve Himself, but to seek and save the lost and give His life a ransom for many. Since God was permitting Him to drink this bitter cup it must be because His suffering and death were needful to fulfil the great purpose of redeeming a fallen world. Salvation for men out of His own suffering and death, victory for God out of shame and defeat —these are the assurances that the Psalm was calculated to bring; and need we hesitate to affirm that they sounded in this great cry from the Cross, even though the words taken strictly by themselves are susceptible of a faithless meaning?

Paul Tillich ranks as a force in contemporary thought. Not many of us perhaps on this side of the Atlantic have pictured him to ourselves as a preacher. Yet he often preaches and we have available a volume of his sermons and shorter addresses entitled *The New Being*.[1] Let it be understood that they are not ' popular ' sermons. They were delivered mostly in colleges and universities. But ministers will find in all of them new points of view, new emphases, new light.

Tillich thus explains the title of his book—' If I were asked to sum up the Christian message for our times in two words, I would say with Paul it is the message of a new Creation . . . the new Being, the new Reality which appeared with the appearance of Jesus who for this reason, and just for this reason, is called the Christ.' The sermons or addresses are grouped under three heads—the new Being as Love, the new Being as Freedom, the new Being as Fulfilment.

One sermon in the section on Freedom is entitled ' By What Authority? ' It is based on Lk 20^{1-8} where priests, scribes, and elders questioned Jesus as to His authority, and He declined to answer save by presenting them with a problem about the baptism of John which they could not answer. The first point he makes is that the questioners had plausible enough grounds for asking Jesus ' by what authority.' As priests, scribes, and elders they were the recognized authorities in Judaism, and they could all state what gave them authority. Jesus is infringing in a revolutionary way on their spheres. Let us put ourselves in their place, What would our own reaction to the ministry of Jesus have been? Might we, too, not have reasoned that for the sake of our people we must defend our consecrated and tested authority against this Man who cannot show the source of authority He claims. We see the same kind of conflict in the Reformation; and to-day Protestant authorities might be asked, ' Are you certain that the insistence on your authority, on your tradition and on your experience does not suppress the kind of authority which Jesus had in mind? '

Tillich then passes to discuss the meaning of authority. First of all, it means that we are finite and in need of authority. We are dependent first on parents, then on teachers; and this authority is the basis for all other authorities from which we reap benefit as life goes on. What would be the plight of a student of science without authoritative text-books and lectures by experts? Authority permeates, guides, shapes our lives. Without the authority of the State civilized life would perish. ' He who tries to be without authority tries to be like God who alone is by Himself. And like every one who tries to be like God he is thrown down to self-destruction, be it a single human being, be it a nation, be it a period of History like our own.'

In the incident before us Jesus and His opponents both acknowledge authority. They differ as to *valid* authority, not authority as such. There is something in the Christian message which is opposed to established authority and this something is indicated in the question about the baptism of John, was it from God or man, and in the refusal to answer the question as to His own authority. ' That which makes an answer impossible is the nature of an authority which is derived from God not man. God-given authority cannot be circumscribed nor legally defined.' ' It cannot be put into the fences of doctrines and rituals. It is here and you do not know whence it comes. You cannot derive it. You must be grasped by it. You must participate in its power.' So the problem of authority can never get an ultimate answer. There are of course preliminary answers. ' There is no day in our lives in which we do not give silently or openly answers to the question of authority, saying mostly " yes " and sometimes " no." Yet an ultimate answer cannot be given.' We can only point to a reality as Jesus points to John or as John did to Jesus. Churches, ministers, theologians, and all who try to teach Christianity should just point to Jesus. ' We can all point passionately but not as established authorities to the Crucified. We should point not to ourselves but to the reality which again and again breaks

[1] S.C.M.; 10s. 6d. net.

through the established forms of our authority and through the hardened forms of our personal experience.'

The freedom of the Christian man under the spirit of God does not mean that the subordinate authority—home, school, community, Church, State, and so on may be cast aside. They are far from valueless; they are *media* through which God imparts manifold blessings. Yet, none of them is absolute and unquestionable. 'Beyond all preliminary authority we must keep ourselves open to the Power of Him who is the ground and negation of everything which is authority on earth and in heaven.' That takes some thinking out but it will repay the effort.

Poetry and Theology

By the Reverend Roy McVicar, M.A., Edinburgh

The wide realms of reading which the preacher is urged to make himself familiar with seem to grow with each generation. As one reads, for example, H. E. Luccock's *In a Minister's Workshop*, one can hardly help being discouraged by the subjects which he says should be studied. There are specifically theological books, more especially those which open up the meaning of the Bible; there is the pageant of history, supplemented by sociological, political, and economic subjects; there is modern science and thought, not omitting those writers who deny the truth of Christianity; and there are newspapers, magazines, and periodicals, which will keep the preacher up-to-date on the issues of the day.

In addition to all this, he makes a special plea for the literature of imagination, and says uncompromisingly: 'The preacher who is too busy to read poetry . . . is too busy.' The first reaction to this is surely one of protest.

But is there a case for poetry? Unfortunately poetry is so often recommended for reasons which do not justify it; either for the meaning or message it contains, or else as a source of effective quotations, which serve to cover up a pathetic poverty of thought.

Before trying to bring out some of the positive values and uses of poetry for the preacher, its real value in and for itself is worth remembering—the sheer pleasure which it gives. 'Delight,' said John Dryden, 'is the chief, if not the only, end of poesy.'

More cogent, perhaps, is the fact that poetry is one of the greatest products of the human mind. Its very greatness lays an obligation upon all who make any pretence to culture. Shelley makes no meagre claim for his art when he affirms: 'Poetry is the record of the best and happiest moments of the happiest and best minds. . . . Poetry thus makes immortal all that is best and most beautiful in the world.'

From one point of view, then, there is no need to argue the value and relevance of poetry to the preacher. We can only agree wholeheartedly with Douglas Bush when he says that 'the poetic apprehension of life has its own validity; and the essential function of poetry is to preserve, discipline and enrich the humanity, humility, and spirituality of man in the midst of the dehumanizing forces that more and more envelop him.' There is surely no need to make a special plea for anything which helps the preacher to keep his 'humanity, humility, and spirituality,' qualities without which he can hardly hope to reach his people.

Because art and religion are so closely linked, each is certain to enrich and invigorate the other. We are familiar with the ways in which a fresh religious impulse has shown itself in an outburst of great and original art. But are we as quick to recognize the beneficial effect of art on religion? Do we admit the salutary influence of poetry on preaching? If poetry will give, as Edith Sitwell says, 'increased vitality and a more passionate sense of life and power for living,' then let the preacher beware of ignoring it. Poetry is much more than a pleasure, or a part of culture.

The heart of the matter is that poetry is creative. Because poetry is the expression of a mind of unusual sensitivity and vitality and insight, it has a vivid effect on the mind and heart and experience of the reader. The power of poetry is often explained in terms of De Quincey's distinction between literature of power and literature of knowledge: but Sir Desmond McCarthy has made a distinction more useful for our purpose. On the one hand, a book may be valuable in 'enabling me to understand something better than I did before: that is to say, it may have value as a means, though of no value in itself.' On the other hand, a book may have value *in itself*, in that it 'claims to give us an experience worth having in itself.' Poetry claims to do that.

Can we define more exactly what is the effect of art and poetry? Robert Louis Stevenson says that 'their influence is profound and silent, like the influence of nature; they mould by contact; we drink them up like water, and are bettered, yet

know not how.' This influence 'by contact' he makes more explicit when he speaks of the effect of Wordsworth on himself: 'These best teachers climb beyond teaching to the plane of art; it is themselves, and what is best in themselves, that they communicate.' For a brief, glowing moment we become greater than ourselves by this direct contact with the poets; our own personality takes on an intenseness, a sensitiveness, a sort of radiance, which we do not normally possess, and which is not possible for us unaided.

Poets see and feel more than the ordinary person, and so they make us see and feel as they do, and enlarge and deepen experience. Since the minister must touch life at so many points and levels, since he must, if he is to be effective, be sympathetic and responsive to all that is human and natural, poetry can do him great service. The poet sees so much more and so much deeper into the heart of things, and he shares his vision with us. The poet feels so much more intensely, knows vividly the whole range of human emotion from the joyous agony of love to the disrupting heaviness of grief, and he makes us react to life with the same acuteness of feeling. The poet is awake and alive to so much beauty and surprise in life, and he startles us out of our usual state of half-sleep. Now it is just this sympathy and responsiveness that one misses so often in the minister. But when he learns to share something of the poet's vision and passion and aliveness, he will also become more sensitive, more intimately in touch with life, a greater, more human, more humble man. It is nothing less than 'the re-creation in us of another man's experience.'

Let us make more concrete this 're-creation' of one man's experience in another. In *Julius Cæsar*, when Casca relates his terrifying night in Rome, he tells how among other things he met a lion, 'who glar'd upon me, and went surly by.' When we read or hear these words, we do not just receive a bit of information; we experience an emotion, we feel a sensation. For as Lascelles Abercrombie commented, 'there was never any other lion quite like that.' In this moment when a new experience comes to us, three factors are at work.

One, there is what was in the mind of the poet when he wrote the words; the emotional experience when his intense imaginative sympathy enabled him to be, for the time, Casca on that awful night. Two, there is the poet's art in communicating that experience; the superb and unique choice of words whereby his inward emotion was translated into language; his poetic power of charging words and phrases not only with meaning, but with sensitive, creative force. Three, there is our experience as we read the words and re-enact within ourselves the poet's sensations, so that we see what he saw, feel what he felt, and become what he was. William Temple said, 'if the poet is successful, . . . he carries us through sympathy into a real participation of his own experience, so that we are different, if only by a small amount, for ever after.'

Especially is this true of our relation to other people. Of nothing should we preachers be more humble than our knowledge of people, and of nothing should we be more repentant than our glib and surface judgments of them. What poverty we show in our understanding of human nature! I believe that the reason for this is that we judge our fellows out of our own small and narrow experience.

Anything, therefore, which will make us more sympathetic, in the true sense of 'feeling with others,' must be indispensable to true preaching. And while fiction and drama make human nature and human beings their special sphere, poetry has its own contribution to make.

How clear-sighted Tennyson's knowledge of humanity when he spoke of

> . . . the long-neck'd geese of the world that are ever hissing dispraise
> Because their natures are little, and, whether he heed it or not,
> Where each man walks with his head in a cloud of poisonous flies.

How vivid D. H. Lawrence's understanding of soul-darkness:

> That awful and sickening endless sinking, sinking through the slow, corruptive levels of disintegrative knowledge
> when the self has fallen from the hands of God.

What an intense awareness of futility is compressed in that tense phrase of Shakespeare's: 'Life's but a walking shadow.'

These examples make clear that the poet's understanding of life and people differs sharply from the psychologist's. Indeed we may distinguish them by saying that psychology gives us *knowledge* of human nature, whereas poetry gives *experience*; that is, poetry does not take people to bits to see how they work, but is understanding from inside, the understanding of true sympathy and identification, like that of Whitman when he said that he 'became the wounded man.' That was Jesus' way. He never analyzed people. He knew them by that swift intuition in which one spirit leaps to another and is united to it. More than anything else, religion needs that kind of understanding: not the cold analytical kind that reduces people to cases, but the radiant kind that creates confidence and love, which in themselves have such healing power. And the end of this

understanding is not just a more effective ministry, but fuller and more satisfying relations with all whom we meet.

Another valuable effect of poetry is to stimulate imagination. So often a preacher's mind, absorbed in professional studies, puts the stamp of dullness on sermons. The line of thought is abstract, the tone is dogmatic, the final result is sombre and solemn.

The best known, as well as the best, definition of imagination comes from Wordsworth : ' It is the faculty of brooding upon some conception until it begins to take shape and colour, to spring up and to dilate, to put forth signs of life and to dilate, and so to clothe itself in words and images and trains of thought, which are as truly expressive of its real nature as the human face and body are expressive of the human personality which informs them.'

It is these qualities of shape and colour and life that save a sermon from being dull and prosy ; and reading poetry will undoubtedly stimulate the imagination. Abercrombie has described this as ' the magical infection of our minds with the poet's mind by means of language.' To be imaginatively alive, not only to see and feel more deeply oneself, but to be able to make others see and feel, to commend the gospel in images and phrases that burn and glow and quiver with reality, is to fulfil with the greater power our calling as heralds.

In addition to its effect on experience and imagination, poetry is of inestimable worth in teaching respect for words. And none are more guilty than preachers of a careless, lofty disdain for words. Very often their disregard for words is only too evident in the poverty and clumsy inadequacy of their language, or in the monotonous treadmill of expression, the dismal plodding round the same phrases and figures of speech, sermon after sermon.

The preacher, like R.L.S., should live with words. And where else will he learn the value of words better than with the poets ! Just to read them with an ear for their music will develop a sure instinct for the right word, and will safeguard, not only from bad grammar and bad taste, but also from the paltry ineffectiveness of ordinary language. And if the preacher will go still further, if he will study the poets and learn why they choose this word and reject that one, if he will learn to distinguish fine shades of meaning and begin to see how one right word can be more effective than a whole sentence, and to understand what it is in the right use of words that gives them power over people's minds and actions, then he will find that words are at once the most wonderful and the most dangerous things ; he will have at his command a host of words from which to choose, and a rich variety of images with which to convey his message. As Stevenson so well said : ' Before he can tell what cadences he truly prefers, the student should have tried all that are possible ; before he can choose and preserve a fitting key of language, he should long have practised the literary scales ; and it is only after years of such gymnastic that he can sit down at last, legions of words swarming to his call, dozens of turns of phrase simultaneously bidding for his choice.'

The preacher must, then, be a craftsman with words, and must be willing to learn his craft. But there is something even more important about words which he learns from poetry, and that is their *emotional* value, what it is that gives them power to move others and awaken in them the feelings and experiences one wishes.

This is the distinction between mere description of a fact, and the poetic interpretation of the fact. Take an everyday fact like the coming of darkness : one can describe it in as many words, the deepening shadows, the moon rising, the stars coming out, and a reader understands perfectly. But how different when a poet tells us

> The moving Moon went up the sky,
> And no where did abide ;
> Softly she was going up,
> And a star or two beside.

Preaching is too often in the form of mere matter-of-fact, and too little using words with emotional power. Some preachers even pride themselves on it. But the bare truth expressed in cold lifeless words rarely reaches the heart. Surely the aim of preaching is to move as well as to teach, to secure a verdict as well as to convey a truth. And to do this we need to know the dynamic value of words, to grasp the poet's secret which is not only to comment but to communicate.

There will also come into our preaching, from the mastery of words, the secret of *freshness*. Perhaps the greatest sin of preaching is dullness, sameness of thought and expression. How many ministers cannot mention ' peace ' without adding ' that passes understanding.' Words like ' crisis ' are overworked for lack of alternatives. And so on through an endless list that recur in so many sermons. There are probably two reasons for this. Either the preacher's mind is so soaked in text-book language that he is not conscious of the monotony ; or else, he is forced to use the same words again and again because of the poverty of his vocabulary. The more the mind is stored with images and pictures, the more words one has at one's command, the more likely one is to produce fresh, virile, even strange and startling expressions for the old truths.

The poet more than any other must find fresh forms of both experience and expression. One

might imagine that such a common theme as 'sunset' would be exhausted, that it would be almost impossible to find a phrase which had not been used by poets before. I always thought Coleridge had said the last word when he spoke of 'that green light that lingers in the west.' The word 'lingers' seemed to me to be perfect, until I found D. H. Lawrence creating a new reaction by saying

> We could gather up the dry hay from
> The hill-brow, and lie quite still, till the green
> Sky ceased to quiver, and lost its active sheen.

That word 'quiver' is a new experience.

When the mind lives on a varied wealth of images, stores them up, keeps its youth by constant renewal, then the preacher will be saved from stagnation. Preaching does not consist in finding new truths, but in presenting old truths in new, live forms. Not the least valuable function of the poet is to keep language alive; and any one who wishes to speak effectively to his own age cannot afford to ignore what the poets are doing. And while preaching is not poetry, there can be no doubt that preaching would be enriched and enlivened by 'the subtler approach, the more intuitive handling of words and ideas which characterize poetry.'

Lastly, there is the value of poetry to the preacher himself, of poetry's contribution to fuller living. In their introduction to *The London Book of English Verse*, the editors say this: 'All poetry has a single inclusive aim: to move us, to pluck some chord, even to touch some single note, in the sensitive organism of our being. There are many chords waiting to be plucked. . . .'

These words reveal not only the scope of poetry; they also affirm the scope of human life. There is so much to be experienced: so many emotions to be lived, so much truth to be known, so much beauty to be loved. There are depths we shall never reach, and heights we shall never attain. As T. S. Eliot said, 'most people are only a very little alive.' Through poetry we shall become more sensitive to life's variety, and more responsive to it; and we shall find that even in our own age it is 'bliss to be alive, and to be young is very heaven.'

Literature

THE ANGLICAN TRADITION

'It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England . . . to keep the mean between the two extremes of too much stiffness in refusing and of too much easiness in admitting any variation from it.' This principle, which the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer applies to the Anglican Liturgy, is also, Professor Norman Sykes tells us in *Old Priest and New Presbyter* (Cambridge University Press; 27s. 6d. net), true of Anglican polity. 'The Anglican tradition has espoused a *via media* in regard to episcopacy, constructed by its defenders against the two extremes of Rome and Geneva. In accordance with this tenacious adherence to the mean, the Church of England has nowhere formulated any theoretical or theological doctrine of episcopacy; but has contented itself with the assertion of the historical ground of the continuance of the threefold ministry since the Apostolic Age. Certainly no exclusive claim can be substantiated from the statements in the Preface to the Ordinal, Articles 19 and 36, and Canon VIII of the Canons of 1604. During the several centuries of its history since the Reformation, its representative divines have so interpreted these formularies as to require episcopacy where it may be had without sacrificing purity of doctrine, and not to unchurch those churches deprived of it by ineluctable historical necessity.'

Such is the author's summary of the important thesis of these lectures delivered in the Universities of Birmingham and Edinburgh. In the course of substantiating it (which he succeeds in doing with great lucidity), he not only reviews the familiar evidence from the Anglican formularies and the works of the Elizabethan and Caroline divines, but presents us with a considerable amount of fresh and highly interesting material, especially in relation to the position of the non-episcopally ordained Lutheran missionaries employed by the S.P.C.K. throughout the eighteenth century as ministers of the Word and Sacraments to Anglican congregations in India.

The book begins with a brief examination of the Reformers' doctrine of the 'godly prince,' with whom the Anglican leaders associated the 'godly bishop,' whose office they believed to be ancient and allowable, but not exclusively prescribed in Scripture. As Keble sorrowfully remarked, 'they never venture to urge its (*i.e.* episcopal government's) *exclusive* claim, or to connect the succession with the validity of the holy Sacraments.' This first lecture serves to remind the reader how remarkable a change has come over the dispute about ecclesiastical polity since the sixteenth century. Then the Anglican contention was that no form of polity is exclusively prescribed in Scripture, while the Presbyterian opposition maintained that one such form was indeed laid down

by dominical authority. Nowadays much Anglican apologetic suggests that a particular (episcopal) form *was* enjoined on the Church by the Lord through the apostles, whereas non-Anglican Protestants are more content to affirm what Whitgift and Hooker were trying to urge upon their spiritual ancestors.

The course of this extraordinary change is indicated in the following chapters. The exclusive claims of Presbyterianism, originating among the Genevan party in England and established in Scotland largely through the work of Melville, provoked a strong episcopalian reaction, leading to the counter-assertion of the divine right of episcopacy by seventeenth-century theologians, and to the rigid requirements of the 1662 Act of Uniformity. Even then, however, episcopacy was believed to be necessary to the perfection or integrity of a church, not to its essence. The 'highest' of the Caroline theologians refused to unchurch the Continental Protestants. More might perhaps have been said here about the Anglican insistence upon the apostolic authority of the episcopate as a weapon against Rome as well as against Geneva.

The later chapters deal with the failure of such plans to 'attemper episcopacy unto presbytery' as Ussher's scheme for synodical government, and the consequent hardening of the episcopalian-presbyterian division both in England and Scotland, the important episode of the S.P.C.K. in India, Wake's negotiations with the Gallicans which reveal how far both the Church of England and the Church of Rome have moved since Queen Anne's day, the rise of the Tractarian theory of the Ministry and the modern situation of the Church of England in respect of reunion.

It is perhaps a defect of this last section that it leaves the Tractarian movement as an unexplained phenomenon, appearing suddenly out of the blue. Its roots might have profitably been examined. Nevertheless, Dr. Sykes has demonstrated that just as, in the light of Early Church history, the 'Tractarian emphasis upon the continuous imposition of episcopal hands will not endure the test of the Vincentian Canon,' so the appeal to English Church history refutes the claim that Anglicans are committed to the doctrine that episcopacy is of the 'esse' of the Church. He has vindicated the traditional Anglican *via media* for all except those for whom 'the dogma must conquer history.' G. W. H. Lampe

---

WANTED—A CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

'What is there in common between Athens and Jerusalem?' asked Tertullian, but Clement of Alexandria said 'Thy foot shall not stumble if thou attribute to Providence all good, whether it belongs to the Greeks or to us.' The Christian debate about the aim and content of education has swung between these two poles ever since, and is taken up again in *An Approach to Christian Education* (Epworth Press; 12s. 6d. net), largely on Clement's side. In this symposium much of the writing is concerned to show what such subjects as Science, Mathematics, History, Classics, Modern Literature have to contribute to Christian education and their right to a place in the same company as Divinity and School Worship. For all who write are agreed that Christian education in a school must be concerned with the curriculum as well as with 'spirit and atmosphere.' It is a commendation of the book that all the essayists have had experience of teaching at school or university level, and include a headmaster and two senior masters as well as two professors. R. E. Davies, who edits the book and contributes three of the essays, was himself Chaplain at Kingswood School, Bath, and all the others have direct or indirect contacts with this school.

When this school was opened, Charles Wesley's prayer was, we are told, 'Unite the pair so oft disjoined, Knowledge and vital piety,' to which all, who write here, say Amen. 'The chief curse of modern education is its intense departmentalism,' writes R. E. Davies in the opening essay, 'Wanted—A Christian Philosophy of Education.' So in its own way and at school level the book is concerned with the same kind of discussion as 'The Crisis in the University' or 'Christianity and Higher Education.' Naturally in a composite work of this kind all the contributors will not make the same appeal to everyone. Those whose subject is Science may find what Charles Coulson has to say speaks most clearly to them, while Modern Language specialists may best see the point in the setting of Will G. Moore's essay. Ministers may find themselves most at home in the chapters on Divinity and School Worship. Yet each essay never loses sight of the fact that Christian education should be a whole.

This is a small book—only a hundred and fifty-nine pages—but it is a timely book. We have too easily believed that morning prayers and Scripture periods guarantee a Christian education for our children, whatever else happens in the curriculum, or in the life of the school. It is becoming increasingly obvious, and this book confirms it, that this is not so. Yet 'the Christian frontier is in the school' and, if the battle is to be won, there is need for strategical thinking of the kind to which this book gives encouragement.

All the contributors are Methodists, but there is nothing sectarian in their views. John Gray

ISRAEL AND CHINA

The Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion, delivered within the University of London, are required to be given by a scholar who is at home in two religions. Professor H. H. Rowley has chosen to speak on *Prophecy and Religion in Ancient China and Israel* (Athlone Press ; 21s. net.). At first sight the comparison seems strange, though it would be quite easy to find affinities between Hebrew and Chinese wisdom. But Professor Rowley's bolder choice of theme has amply justified itself. He begins by first making clear what he understands by a prophet, and then goes on to consider the prophets of Israel as statesmen, as reformers, and as bearers of the hope of a golden age in the future. In each of these cases, he is able to show that there are points of contact with Chinese figures. But when he comes to consider worship, his finding is that ' the prophets of Israel and the Sages of China are in two different worlds.' In the last chapter, he shows that, while a Chinese teacher might well venerate and follow Heaven, he lacked that sense of God as personal, that communion with Him, and that insight into His will in the contemporary situation, that are characteristic of men like Amos and Isaiah.

Professor Rowley makes use of recent critical studies of the Chinese classics, though he still appeals often to Legge. He deals particularly with Confucius, Mo-tsũ, and Mencius. The second was perhaps the one genuinely religious figure China produced before the advent of Buddhism, and his message was that Heaven loves all men and that all men should love each other, for that is the will of Heaven. Professor Rowley's judgments are independent and will not always command assent. He values Mencius less highly than many would, and he defends Mo-tsũ against the charge of utilitarianism. Some would hold, as he does not, that the attitude of Confucius was purely humanist. The only point at which I should myself be disposed to quarrel with him would be over the Taoist classic Waley translates as ' The Way of Wisdom and Virtue.' His general principle of interpretation is a sound one, especially in the case of an ancient author : one should err on the side of generosity in interpreting him. Has he been true to it in this one case, however ?

A footnote of my own might be of interest. When in Japan I bought a German text-book giving a course of lectures in philosophy delivered at the Sun Yat Sen University, Moscow. The lecturer dismissed all the Chinese thinkers of early days as bourgeois and antiquated—except Mo-tsũ. His religion, to be sure, was an aberration, but his logic, his commonsense, his contempt for extravagant display, and his concern for the ordinary man and such simple things as peace and a sufficiency of food to eat, made him near akin to us.

E. L. Allen

MESSIANISM IN ISRAEL

In 1927 Dr. Joseph Klausner published in Hebrew a volume in which he gathered together three studies which had been issued separately, two of them at first in German. This work, in the revised form the author gave it in 1949, has been translated into English by Dr. W. F. Stinespring, the translator of Klausner's ' From Jesus to Paul,' under the title *The Messianic Idea in Israel* (Allen and Unwin ; 30s. net). It falls into three sections, dealing with the Old Testament, the inter-testamental literature, and the Tannaitic literature.

In some respects Dr. Klausner is closer to present-day trends in Old Testament study than he was in 1927, though there is little evidence of awareness of this. His caution in textual criticism, as well as in rejecting as late interpolation all messianic passages in the pre-exilic prophets, would be shared by many to-day. On the other hand, he is unrepresentative of recent trends in that he pays little attention to the cult as the background of the messianic idea. In consequence the Psalter has a few meagre pages.

As against many older scholars, the author maintains the antiquity of the messianic idea in Israel, and denies that it was an importation from abroad. Here, once more, he would find much support to-day. So, too, in his distinguishing between the messianic idea and the idea of the Messiah. The Suffering Servant and the Son of Man are rightly distinguished from the Messiah, but related to the messianic idea. In the reviewer's judgment, the cult might here have been considered with advantage as the basis of the various ideas in this field which find expression in the Old Testament.

On the inter-testamental literature Dr. Klausner offers his own contribution on many disputed questions. He assigns the Book of Jubilees to the age of Alexander Jannaeus, and regards the mysterious Taxo of the Assumption of Moses as the error of a copyist or translator for Matteya, or Mattathias. Had the work been revised for the English edition, some account of the Qumran texts might have been expected, even though it is too early for any final appraisal of them.

Many readers will find themselves on less familiar ground when they come to the third section of the book. Perhaps on this account they will profit most from its study, and will appreciate having a book which traces the line to the Tannaitic literature, instead of to the New Testament. Through-

out the volume Christian readers will find it no small advantage to approach this whole subject under the guidance of a Jew, and so to get away from the presuppositions with which they may be inclined to come to it. The Appendix to the volume, on the Jewish and Christian Messiah, has been translated from the *Magnes Festschrift*, and it forms a fitting and valuable conclusion to a notable volume. To the translator thanks are due for the skilful performance of what must have been a very difficult task.

H. H. Rowley

FREE CHURCH UNITY

Free Church Unity, by the Rev. E. K. H. Jordan, D.Phil. (Lutterworth Press; 12s. 6d. net), is in effect the history of the Free Church Council Movement from its origin in 1896 as the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches. The book also includes a history of the other wing of the movement, the Federal Council of the Free Churches, which was formed in 1919. The narrative closes with the coming together of the two bodies in 1940 to form the Free Church Federal Council.

The book is based on a university thesis, which itself was based on and included a number of original documents. It is therefore authoritative, but at the same time Dr. Jordan has made his material into the form of a very readable story.

The early days, including the formative period before 1896, are graphically portrayed with pen pictures of the men who were the real creators of the Council, Charles Berry of Wolverhampton, and Hugh Price Hughes. It was a popular movement in accord with the mood of the day, and it literally leapt ahead, an organization of twenty Councils or so becoming in the end over one thousand in England and Wales. The main impetus at first was evangelistic, and the Council organized perhaps the largest combined evangelistic effort of that day or since, the Simultaneous Mission.

Nonconformists, however, were soon to be deeply involved in the educational controversy which led to the movement called Passive Resistance. Dr. Jordan is at pains to keep the Free Church Council officially clear of this movement, but perhaps does not allow enough for the popular opinion which identified the Council with this resistance to the Education Act. Undoubtedly the Council suffered by its support (understandable at the time) of the Liberal Party.

An organization like the Free Church Council was bound to be affected by the War of 1914–1918, but there came through the War and just after it a remarkable renaissance identified with the name of Dr. Shakespeare. There followed the formation of the new body, the Federal Council of the Free Churches, and this coincided with the remarkable statement of the Lambeth Conference of 1920, 'An appeal to all Christian People.' Conversations between the Federal Council and Anglican representatives followed. There seemed, as a result, little outward progress, but the old bitterness disappeared and there came a spirit of fellowship. During the Second World War the two Free Church bodies joined together to form the Free Church Federal Council. A chapter on the working out of this new experiment would have been welcomed, but the book closes at the year 1941.

Dr. Jordan postulates some very interesting and indeed provocative questions in the chapter 'Whither the Free Churches?' It takes account of the formation of the British Council of Churches and that international body with which it is so closely associated, the World Council of Churches. He points out that at the same time the denominations have strengthened their ties with their Confessional brethren throughout the world. These two developments have had their effect upon the Free Church Federal Council with its more limited objective. What might be called the world view has its advantages in that it helps to make the Church one of the great unifying bodies at a time when such an influence is needed, but the English situation still remains urgent. The vast new housing areas which need churches, multitudes of people that are still outside organized churches—these problems would seem to call for much more co-operation among the Free Churches even if that co-operation must for the time being stop short of unity.

This is certainly a book to be read by those who desire an insight into the religious problems of England and Wales to-day. It is a history of the past, but it shows a clear light on the course of events to-day and what may happen to-morrow.

A. D. Harcus

BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY

A cordial welcome will be given to the first two numbers of the series 'Studies in Biblical Archæology,' the introductory number of which has already been reviewed. Both are by Professor André Parrot, well printed by the S.C.M., and illustrated with plates and figures—good value for 7s. 6d. net.

In the first, *The Flood and Noah's Ark*, translated from the second edition of the French work, which had been expanded by further documentation, the author reiterates his conviction that 'the believer has nothing to fear and much to learn from the resurrection of the biblical past,' and states his aim 'to treat the subjects as objectively

as possible, producing evidence rather than pleading a case.' The flood and the ark are treated in two separate chapters which give clearly the archæological and written evidence. A third chapter discusses the religious aspect of the flood. Of particular interest is his theory as to the way in which the story reached the Old Testament writers, and his dating of the oldest narrative of the flood—the Sumerian—as late as 2000 B.C.

The second book, *The Tower of Babel*, is also well translated; nowhere is one conscious of 'translation English.' The French work was an abridgment of the much larger 'Ziggurats et Tour de Babel,' published in 1949, which in one place is here corrected because of later excavations. There are four chapters. The first gives the literary evidence, accepting Gn 11^{1-9} as J, but ignoring the apparent contradiction between *vv.* 5 and 7, which is usually regarded as evidence of the use of a poetic source; the author also translates *hummanim* as 'pillar' rather than as 'incense altar.' He notes that nowhere else in the whole Bible is the Babel story mentioned, and that Ezekiel's vision (43^{13-17}) of the new temple really pictures a ziggurat. The second chapter gives fully the archæological evidence; the third traces the use of the story in Christian art, suggesting that the lateness of the first representation—the eleventh century—may be due to the fact that the story was not traditionally a subject used symbolically in Christian thought. The final chapter deals with the Tower of Babel and Theology, enlarging on the author's view that 'the Tower of the Scriptures was not the expression of man's pride. Instead of a clenched fist raised in defiance toward Heaven, I saw it rather as a hand stretched out in supplication, a cry to Heaven for help.' In Professor Parrot's view the top was the abode of the God who comes down to man in the second sanctuary at the foot of the building; he would reject the suggestion that ziggurats represent an attempt by an immigrant people, from a mountain region, to transfer to the Babylonian plain their myth of a mountain abode for their God. To the author they are the forerunners of the Christmas story. But you should buy the books and read them yourself.

J. N. SCHOFIELD

Modern man cannot honestly accept the old descriptions of heaven and hell as they used to be given. The harps and streets of gold are as incredible as the everlasting fire and brimstone. Yet a man's belief in his own life after death is one of supreme importance. In an admirable little book —*Heaven and Hell: What Can You Believe about Them?* (Abingdon Press; $1.00)—the Rev. John Sutherland Bonnell of Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, gives answers which are eminently reasonable, based always on a true understanding of Scripture. Problems arose because preachers expounded as sober prose what in Scripture is really poetical and symbolical.

Much of the future life remains hidden from us, but we are taught that for good or ill it is most intimately connected with our life here and now. In this life every man carries heaven or hell in his own heart. This book will be of the greatest assistance to many, especially—but far from exclusively—young people.

Buddhist Meditation, by Dr. Edward Conze (Allen and Unwin; 12s. 6d. net) (the latest addition to the series of 'Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West,' intended to make more accessible to the intelligent public the ethical and religious masterpieces of the world), is written by one who is specially well qualified for his task. Dr. Conze is a Buddhist scholar of repute, and, moreover, has been teaching psychology for the last twenty years, so that he has abundant data for the comparison of ancient and modern attitudes to the spiritual and mental healing which might be expected to result from the deliberate practice of meditation. His selections are well chosen, varied in range, and frequently helpful and beautiful, whatever we may think of the intrinsic merit of some of the details. Of his admiration for his Eastern sources there is no doubt. Of Buddhaghosa's 'Path of Purity' (*c.* A.D. 400, his chief source book) he says that if he were restricted to only one book as companion on a desert island this would be his choice. The selections are intended to give guidance in the cultivation of 'mindfulness' or concentration, leading to trancic states and to a vision of ultimate Reality through the attainment of Wisdom; and concentration, or 'one-pointedness,' in Buddhism is not merely an intellectual effort but a reorientation of the whole personality. At the same time the intellectual tendency is dominating, and Wisdom, we are told, is the supreme virtue, because ignorance, and not sin, is at the root of evil. The path to Nirvana is shown to be mainly negative, although it would be a mistake to suppose the deepest Reality is emptiness.

It is conceded by the author that Buddhistic meditation and modern psychotherapy are alike in that they both aim at mental and spiritual health, but contemporary psychologists are so hampered by their close relationship to modern civilisation (with its individualism, its engrossment in ordinary occupations and its lack of monastic practices) that they can have little hope of penetrating beyond the outer court and dis-

covering the ultimate secret which means deliverance. These meditations, our author says in his otherwise excellent introductory chapter, afford little prospect of attainment to the prisoners of modern civilization, which, according to Peguy (quoted with considerable approval), is 'one vast conspiracy against the spiritual life.'

The evidence submitted on behalf of the Church of England Moral Welfare Council to the Departmental Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution, with other material relating thereto, has been compiled and edited by Dr. Derrick Sherwin Bailey, and is now published at 6s. 6d. by the Church Information Board under the title, *Sexual Offenders and Social Punishment*. There is much useful information as well as reverent and frank discussion here, and the publication is opportune in view of the probability that the Wolfenden Committee will issue its report this autumn.

Despite the peculiar difficulties of our time for printing and publishing, the *magnum opus* of Professors A. A. Luce and T. E. Jessop keeps steadily on the way toward completion. We now have *The Works of George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne*, vol. 7 (Nelson; 30s. net). It is edited by Professor Luce and contains Berkeley's Sermons, Notes of Sermons, Essays to the Guardian, Journals of his Italian Tours, and other minor writings. Previous volumes have shown us Berkeley as philosopher, mathematician, and economist. This reveals him as 'preacher, pastor, essayist, and projector of a scheme of education that has left its mark and contained great possibilities for the colonies of those days.'

The Sermons are arranged chronologically and cover over forty years of Berkeley's life. The preaching, says Dr. Luce, is 'not great but good.' The Sermons are interesting not for any use a modern preacher might find in them, but as showing how Berkeley was the product as well as the admonisher of his days. There are no purple patches. The sermons are addressed persuasively to the reason and commonsense and religious instincts of the congregation.

To each section Dr. Luce prefaces an Introduction revealing in many cases the extraordinary hardness of his task in determining from damaged manuscripts what Berkeley really wrote.

Two more volumes will complete the task; the eighth will contain Berkeley's letters, the ninth a commentary thereon and a general index. One may be confident that this work will be accepted as the definitive edition of Berkeley's writings.

The Concept of Newness in the New Testament, by the Rev. R. A. Harrisville, is an abstract of a doctorate thesis submitted to Princeton Theological Seminary, and is an off-print from the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. lxxiv. Part ii. The writer's stated aim is to prove that the common terms for *new* in the New Testament have the same meaning, to elaborate the Biblical connotation of the conception of newness, and to show that in all the passages about newness there exists a common denominator, which makes them capable of yielding a total view.

Commonly a distinction is drawn between the two commonest words for *new* in the New Testament. To put it very briefly, *neos* is said to describe something which is new *in point of time*, while *kainos* is said to describe something which is new not only in point of time, but also *in point of quality*. That differentiation was fully stated by Trench in 'Synonyms of the New Testament.' Dr. Harrisville declares it to be an artificial distinction, and declares that by making it Trench threw modern lexicography into confusion. We are not forgetting that this is an abstract, and that the full case cannot be stated, but we are by no means convinced that Dr. Harrisville is right and that Trench is wrong.

Dr. Harrisville distinguishes four characteristics in the Biblical conception of *newness*. There is *contrast* with that which went before, but there is also *continuity*; there is a *dynamic* power, and there is *finality*.

The author makes one odd mistake. In quoting his linguistic authorities he speaks of 'Suidas, the tenth-century lexicographer.' *Suidas* is not the name of an author; it is the name of a book. It is actually a Greek adaptation of a Latin word meaning a *fortress* or *stronghold*, and was used because in those times it was customary to give collections, dictionaries, and anthologies such fanciful names.

This abstract has very greatly whetted our appetite for the whole work.

President John A. Mackay of Princeton has issued in the Princeton Pamphlets series a study the substance of which has twice before formed part of a published volume—*Protestantism* (Princeton Theological Seminary; 50 cents).

Historical description of Protestantism is followed by theological interpretation of its major doctrinal emphases, and both are ably done; but for most readers the chief interest will lie in the concluding section, which deals with contemporary developments. Here Dr. Mackay selects four major points—the rediscovery of Christian orthodoxy, the affirmation of evangelical catholicity, a reawakened concern for the secular order and a demand for an ecumenical theology—and makes interesting

comments upon them with references to recent movements in some of which the author himself has taken a leading part.

Thine is the Kingdom, by Professor James S. Stewart, D.D. (St. Andrew Press ; 7s. 6d. net), is based upon the author's Duff Lectures. It deals with the Church's mission in our time and provides an approach to a theology of missions by way of an examination of the New Testament doctrine of the Lordship of Christ. Professor Stewart affirms that the missionary imperative for the Church springs out of the redemptive indicative of the Divine action in history, and that the total meaning of history is the universal reign of Christ. He suggests also that the goal of missions—whether victory within history or beyond it, both of which views find support in the New Testament—may be one of the questions which our Lord intentionally left unanswered. In any case the Church's task is clear. We wish this challenging yet encouraging proclamation a wide and attentive audience.

Many outside the Salvation Army will welcome the biography of Theodore Hopkins Kitching, father of the present General, which has been excellently written by one who knew him intimately, Archibald R. Wiggins. It is entitled *T.H.K.* (Salvationist Publishing and Supplies ; 7s. 6d. cloth, 4s. 6d. paper). T.H.K., as he was affectionately known, was one of the ablest and most striking personalities to whose long, devoted and highly efficient services the Salvation Army owed much. He had many friends outside the Army in every walk of life, not least among the magnates of Fleet Street while he was editor of ' War-Cry.' His skill in languages made him an invaluable international secretary. How this tower of strength developed out of an originally shy boy of Quaker ancestry makes a most interesting story.

A moderately priced book which we cordially recommend to all interested in the distinguishing characteristics of ' the chosen people ' is Dr. Ludwig Köhler's *Hebrew Man* (S.C.M. ; 12s. 6d. net). We have it in a wholly admirable English translation by Peter R. Ackroyd. Dr. Köhler is an acknowledged authority on Hebrew archaeology. This book is a publication of a short course of lectures given in Tübingen University in 1952. Appended is a lecture on ' Justice in the Gate,' a Rectorial Address delivered at Zürich in 1931.

The author confines himself to a study of the every-day life of the Hebrew people in its cultural, physical, and social aspects, and into small volume has compressed a vast amount of information.

He begins with physical characteristics, and one interesting point he makes is that there is no such entity as a Semitic race. The Hebrews were of mixed blood. Nor is there a fixed type of Hebrew nose. Then we have ' health and sickness,' which opens with an account of the practice of circumcision, and goes on to enlighten us as to what ' leprosy ' really was, and much more. Then we have two chapters on ' How the Hebrew Lived ' and two on ' How He Thought.' It is not only interesting, it is fascinating. As to its uses for Bible readers, it may be sufficient indication to mention that an Index gives references to some five hundred and sixty texts of the Old Testament, twenty-three to the New Testament, and two to the Apocrypha.

Angels Unawares, by Mr. Stuart B. Jackman (S.C.M. ; 4s. net), is a one-act play intended to be presented in a church as a part of a service of worship. The action is set in a room of a working man's house where an unknown and inoffensive Jew appears in a context of industrial tension and Communist sabotage. He is made a scapegoat by members of a decent family who are no strangers to loyalty and sacrifice. There are dramatic moments, and the dialogue is bright, while the plot underlines the Christian estimate of mankind's tragic predicament.

Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Minister Emeritus of Riverside Church, New York, described *What is Vital in Religion* (S.C.M. ; 12s. 6d. net) as his last volume of sermons. This will be a sad announcement for many grateful readers who will cherish the hope that the famous preacher may change his mind. All that need be said of this volume is that the veteran's hand has not yet forgotten its cunning. Shining through these sermons is a long experience of pastoral work as well as the preacher's own brave fight of faith.

Children, Listen (Whitcombe and Tombs, Christchurch, New Zealand ; 4s. 6d. net), is a volume of twenty-two talks to boys and girls, by the Very Rev. Martin Sullivan, Dean of Christchurch, New Zealand. There is a Foreword by the Most Rev. A. W. Averill, D.D,. formerly Archbishop of New Zealand. In these stories the reader will meet Belinda, the motor car ; Wag, the black spaniel ; Wilber, the smoky grey little cat ; George, the mouse ; and Rosiebud, the lady of the house. The talks are all pleasantly written, and will form a most useful source of children's talks. They are written with lightness and with charm, in the language in which they were spoken. There is only one complaint—they sadly overwork the rhetorical question !

The Glosses in the Book of Genesis and the J E Theory

An Attempt at a New Solution

By the Reverend Morris Sigel Seale, M.A., Beirut, Lebanon

In the course of translating the Book of Genesis into colloquial Arabic three things came to my notice in quick succession: (1) I was struck by what I later came to believe was a stylistic principle with the writer, namely, his frequent use of synonyms and glosses. (2) This led to the idea that the duplication of the Divine name could only be another example of this principle. (3) The recognition then followed that this was upsetting the whole of the J E theory.

The story of Jean Astruc and his discovery in 1735, as well as the consequent labours of Bible scholars and critics, and their elaborate subdivisions of the text of the Pentateuch, is a story too well known to need telling here. Regarding the theory as a whole, it may be worth repeating what has been said by Professor E. Robertson: 'When you subdivide your main documents into two, three, four, or more "hands," the disintegration of the theory comes perilously near.' [1]

I wish in this article to confine myself mainly to the linguistic side of the question without touching on the relevant questions of date, authorship, or historicity of the Book in question.

The present writer has come to believe after a long acquaintance and study of the Hebrew text that a possible solution of the puzzling use of the names of God by the writer of Genesis, using now one name, now another, and in places both names together, may be found in the writer's singular method and in his way of writing. We find him making liberal use of glosses and circumlocution; he has a way of putting two synonymous words side by side with or without a conjunction; he says the same thing three times, using each time a different but synonymous word; and he repeats things sufficiently explained already with every new person introduced (to show how the things mentioned affected that special person); it is this peculiar style that has not been sufficiently noticed by scholars before, and has not been considered in its bearing on the use made in the Book of the names of God, and the so-called duplicate accounts of the stories of creation, the flood, the birth of Isaac, etc.

Why does the writer do this? It is not, I think, because he is verbose, or because of some peculiar idiosyncrasy, nor is it Oriental exuberance. I have come to believe that he does it out of sheer necesssity. He is writing for a people and a nation plus a mixed multitude (Ex 12^{38} and Nu 11^{4}); but the people are themselves a great mixture: they are of Bedouin origin, Aramaean domicile, Egyptian upbringing, and Canaanite connexions. Glosses and explanations, plus an extensive use of words taken from Arabic, Akkadian, Aramaic, and Egyptian, are for such people an absolute necessity.

1. *Glosses and Synonyms.* We find a striking example of his style in Gn 1^{11} where a fruit tree is explained as a tree bearing or rather making fruit; we would think that a 'fruit tree' is self-explanatory, but the writer does not think so; the explanation, however, is not repeated in *v.* 12, where he speaks of a tree making fruit, but not a fruit tree.[2] Another example is Gn 6^{21}, 'All food that is eaten.' We would consider the words 'that is eaten' quite redundant, but the writer seems to use them as a gloss for the Hebrew '*ma-akhal.*' We have a third example in Gn 11^{30}: 'Sarai was barren, she had no child.' The writer is here evidently explaining the Hebrew word '*'aqarah*' in addition to telling us about Sarai's childlessness. A fourth example is from Gn 6^{17}: '. . . I do bring the flood of waters upon the earth.' 'Flood' or rather 'the flood' is not in the construct with the following word in the genitive, but in the absolute state. Here again, the writer is apparently explaining to his readers the word '*mabul.*' [3]

The following glosses tell the same story: Gn 1^{11} gives two synonymous words for grass—'*deshe*' and '*'esebh,*' which stand together without a conjunction; they do not stand respectively for tender grass and herbs as some commentators would have us believe, because one of the synonyms is left out from *v.* 29.[4] Another pair is found in Gn 1^{24}—

[1] *The Old Testament Problem: A Re-investigation* [1950].

[2] C. J. Ball, in *The Book of Genesis: Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text* [1896], deletes 'fruit' from Gn 1^{11} because he could not explain it.

[3] Kittel, in *Biblica Hebraica,* tries to smooth over '*mayim*' and offers '*mi-yam*' as an emendation.

[4] J. Skinner, *Genesis* [*I.C.C.*], 23: 'It is impossible to define them [*i.e.,* "*deshe*" and "*esebh*"] with scientific precision.' In Gn 1^{30} we have the gloss '*yereq*' instead of '*deshe,*' where Skinner remarks: 'These linguistic differences are sufficient to prove literary discontinuity of some kind' (p. 35).

'*nefesh*,' '*haya*,' translated living creature; here, too, one of the words is left out from *v.* 28, which proves them synonymous.[1] This is also the case with '*tzelem*' and '*d'muth*' translated 'image' and 'likeness' (*v.* 26), one of which is left out from *v.* 27. Another example comes from Gn 9[2]—'*mora-akhem we hitkhem*,' translated fear and dread; in this case, too, only one of the pair is mentioned in Gn 35[5]. Another pair is '*ger*' and '*toshabh*,' a sojourner and a dweller (Gn 23[4]). Another pair which come in the same verse are '*saq*' and '*amtahath*,' translated sack (Gn 24[27]). Yet another example is '*rahat*' and '*shoqeth*,' meaning a watering trough (Gn 30[38]); they are placed together in the plural without a conjunction, but one of the synonyms only is used in *v.* 41, they are never used together again. One last example is '*lotesh*' '*horesh*' of Gn 4[22]; this has been variously translated as 'hammerer and artificer, or forger of every cutting instrument,' or as 'a whetter or instructor of every artificer.' The old Aramaic Paraphrase *Onkelos* recognizes the two words as synonymous; only '*horesh*' is used in later Scripture for an artisan.[2]

Other pairs such as '*tohu-bohu*' translated waste and void (Gn 1[2]), '*kotz we dardar*' translated thorns and thistles (Gn 3[18]), '*n'a we nad*' translated a fugitive and wanderer (Gn 4[14]), '*nin we nekhed*' translated offspring and posterity (Gn 21[23]). These could hardly be alliteratives since they do not recur in twos again in simple prose narrative.

A gloss which clears up a very difficult passage is Gn 49[4]:

> For thou wentest up to thy father's bed,
> Then thou profanedst my couch, '*'alah*.'[3]

The word '*'alah*' following the word couch cannot mean 'he went up' or 'which he went up,' as this would be a harsh change over from the second person to third. But '*'alah*' coming after '*y'zu'ah*'—couch, may well be a gloss meaning bed. '*'Alat*' means a resting place on some Phœnician gravestone inscriptions, where it is even placed side by side with '*mishkabh*,' a word also found in our Genesis passage (cf. M. Lidsbarski, *Ephemeris für Semitische Epigraphik*, iii. 286).

Ishmael has been much maligned by a wrong rendering of '*pere*' '*adam*,' translated 'as a wild ass among men,' or 'a wild ass of a man' (Gn 16[12]). I have shown elsewhere[4] that '*pere*' means here a wild ass in the Bedouin sense of chief; '*adam*' is a gloss for the benefit of non-Bedouins to show that the reference is to a man not an animal.

We are also told of Ishmael in Gn 21[20] that he was '*robhe*' '*qashshoth*,' translated, 'he became, as he grew up, an archer.' Skinner, says *in loco*: 'The syntax is peculiar, the growing up has been already mentioned.' The truth seems to be that here, too, we have a misunderstood gloss. '*Qashshoth*' judging by the form means not an archer but a maker of bows, quite an honourable profession, since the making of suits of armour is ascribed in pre-Islamic Arabian poetry to both David and Solomon, '*robhe*' from '*rabha*,' to shoot,[5] could mean either a 'shooter,' or, as is more likely, one who made shooting instruments. The two cognate Arabic words are '*qawwas*' and '*barra*.' The Arabic '*bara*' to make an arrow is a metathesis of the Hebrew '*rabha*.'

2. *The Divine Names.* We are now in a position to deal with the duplication of the name of the deity in Gn 2[4]. There can be no doubt that Jehovah as a name is newer than Elohim, or El Shaddai, the Almighty. We are told so very plainly in Ex 6[3], 'And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them.' The fact of its being a newer name would of itself be sufficient reason for not using it alone, at least, not at first, so the writer does here what we have seen him do in other places, in the examples quoted, namely, he uses it together with the older Elohim. It is significant that it is first so used in Gn 2[4], in the section beginning 'These are the generations [lit. begettings] of the heavens and of the earth when they were created. . . .' This verse may have stood originally at the beginning of the Book, because it is one of the formulae of which there are ten altogether in Genesis which serve as a framework for the whole book.[6]

Linguistically the name Jehovah derives from '*ehyeh*'—I am (Ex 3[14]), the verb in the first person singular as spoken by God becomes a proper name when changed into the third person singular; '*ehyeh*' becomes 'Yahweh' just as '*odeh*'—I praise, spoken by Leah, becomes Judah or Yehudah (Gn 29[35]). The difference between the names of God as representative of the theophany is very great indeed. His revelations as El Shaddai

[1] Skinner, *ib.*, 27: This 'has all the awkwardness of a gloss.'

[2] '*Lotesh*,' came to mean later a sharpener or polisher of swords, which is clearly the work of a sword maker.

[3] 'No very acceptable rendering of this difficult clause has been proposed' (Skinner, *ib.*, 515).

[4] See 'Arabic and Old Testament Interpretation' in The Expository Times, lxvi. [December 1954] 92.

[5] *The Gesenius Hebrew English Lexicon*, 916.

[6] S. R. Driver, in *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 6, says: 'The narrative of Genesis is cast into a framework, or scheme, marked by the recurring formula, *These are the generations*.'

were sudden, momentary and overwhelming,[1] but as Jehovah He was an ever-present God who dwelt among His people.

Does the statement of Ex 6^3 rule out the possibility of the use of the name Jehovah by the same writer in the story of the patriarchs? This, we think, need not be the case, since the writer habitually uses new names of places before coming to the events which brought about the change of name. There is his early use of 'Zoar' in Gn 14^2 which was the name given later to one of the doomed cities after it was saved from the general destruction, as we learn from Gn 19^{22}. The writer deals with this name as he does with 'Jehovah'; he puts the city's old and new name together: 'Bela which is Zoar,' but he also uses Zoar by itself without an explanation even before the event, as in Gn 13^{10}.

The writer of the Book of Judges acts in the same way when relating the story of Gideon whose name was changed to Jerubaal. He first uses both names together with an explanation: 'Jerubaal, who is Gideon' (Jg 7^1); he goes on calling him Gideon but also Jerubaal son of Joash (8^{29}); in one place only he puts the two names together, and calls him Jerubaal Gideon (8^{35}).

One last example is from the story of Jacob who was sent off to Padan-aram to stay with Laban the Aramaean (Gn $28^{2.5.6}$); this place is later referred to as just Padan (48^7), and later still it is just Aram (Nu 23^7). I think that it would be fair to conclude that here, too, we have an old and a new name which are first used together, one being supplementary, until the old is dropped.

3. *The Critics' 'selected lists of expressions.'* For the critical analysis of the Genesis documents, the critics make use of 'Selected lists of expressions which are highly characteristic of J and E respectively' (J. Skinner, *ib.*, p. xlix). The two Hebrew words used to describe the destruction of the flood victims, '*gav'u*' and '*metu*,' translated 'expired' and 'died,' are brought forward as proof of literary discontinuity, and indicative of the work of two authors and of two different accounts; 'expired' of Gn 7^{21} is ascribed to P, while the second word 'died' of *v.* 22 is ascribed to J. They have, however, failed to account for a third word, 'blotted out' of *v.* 23. We may see how arbitrary all this is from Gn 25^8 where three different words and phrases for dying are used in this one verse: 'Then Abraham gave up the ghost [lit. expired], and died in a good old age, an old man, and full of years; and was gathered to his people.'

Another example: the two synonyms for young, '*tza'ir*' and '*qatan*' are ascribed to J and E respectively, and yet both these words are found in that part of the story of Joseph which is ascribed to J by Dr. Driver (Gn 43^{33} and 44^{12}).

A third example comes from the story of Abraham where two words are used for a maid servant; so '*shifhah*' of Gn 16 is ascribed to J and '*amah*' of ch. 21 to E. And yet both '*shifhah*' and '*amah*' are used together in the story of Jacob and Rachel (Gn $30^{3.4}$).

A fourth example is taken from the story of Joseph where the two words, '*beth sohar*,' prison, and '*mishmar*,' ward, are ascribed to J and E respectively. A third word also used in the story, namely, '*bor*' a dungeon is ignored. The two synonyms for 'dry land'—'*harabha*' and '*yabasha*'—are likewise assigned to J and E respectively.

It seems certain that the use of different words for 'maid,' for 'dying,' for 'prison,' for 'young' and for 'dry land' is no more than a writer's device. We find him doing the same thing in the story of Isaac (Gn 26), where two different words are used for 'digging a well,' *i.e.*, '*hafar*' and '*khara*'; two words for an 'oath'—'*alah*' in *v.*28 and '*sh'wu'ah*' in *v.* 31; two words for 'overtaking'—'*hissig*' and '*hidbiq*' (Gn $31^{23.25}$; two words for the 'pieces of a carcase'—'*b'tharim*' and '*g'zarim*' (Gn 15)—the former word is here used in the singular, the plural in Jer 34^{18}. Two words are used for paying a visit—'*avar 'al*' (Gn 18^5) and '*sur el*' (19^2). Two words for 'window' in the story of the flood—'*tzohar*' and '*halon*' (Gn 6^{16} and 8^6); three different expressions are used in the same story to describe living beings—'all flesh,' 'all in whose nostrils is the breath of life' and 'all living things' (Gn $7^{21f.}$). And lastly two words are used for creating in Gn 1—'*bara*' and '*'asah*,' while '*yatzar*' of ch. 2 is used rightly for shaping man out of clay, a word also used by Jeremiah to describe the work of the potter (Jer 18^2).

All we have said leads up to the conclusion that the Book of Genesis has been somewhat misunderstood and misjudged by Bible scholars and critics who built up elaborate theories regarding the composition of the Book which they ascribed to an array of writers and redactors. We have tried to show that the key to the Book which the critics have missed is the writer's peculiar style and method, and his use of glosses, explanations, and repetitions. With this linguistic key in hand I feel that we can speak more reassuringly about the unity and antiquity of the first book of Holy Scripture, and the oldest prose work in the Hebrew language.

[1] A revelation of El Shaddai could be 'an horror of great darkness,' (Gn 15^{12}), and could, I think, be described in Isaiah's '*k'shod mishaddai*' (Is 13^6), as an overpowering of the Overpower.

Expository Problems

The Second Coming—Mark xiv. 62

By the Reverend J. A. T. Robinson, M.A., Ph.D., Clare College, Cambridge

'Again the high priest asked him, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" And Jesus said, "I am; and you will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven"'—Mk $14^{61f.}$ (R.S.V.).

This is a saying which, alike in its context and in its content, is of quite crucial importance. It was not only, according to the Synoptists, decisive for the fate of Jesus, but it is literally of unique significance for understanding both His Messianic claim and His expectation of the *Parousia*. For it is the only saying in the Gospels in which Jesus states unequivocally that He is the Messiah. And it may be the only authentic saying in which He predicts His coming in glory as the Son of man. At any rate, Canon J. E. Fison, who argues strongly for the *Parousia* as part of the teaching of Jesus, admits that of the five texts on the Second Coming selected by von Hügel as being 'of immense weight and luminous clearness, which stand above all suspicion of a secondary origin' this one alone can support the burden of proof (*The Christian Hope*, 194). Again, Dr. C. H. Dodd writes in *The Parables of the Kingdom* (p. 96): 'It is doubtful, then, whether the earlier tradition contained explicit predictions of the second coming of Jesus as Son of Man, apart from Mark 14^{62}.'

It is impossible, naturally, in this article to take account of all the other Gospel texts upon which the doctrine of the Second Coming has been based. Above all, there are those sayings, many of them parabolic in form, which speak of a coming visitation for which men are warned to be on the alert. Whether these in fact referred originally to a return of Jesus or, as Dr. Dodd and more recently Professor Jeremias [1] have argued, were spoken to warn the Jews of the imminent crisis under which as a nation they stood, cannot be decided here. But it is relevant to point out that the other sayings which relate to the coming of the Son of man *in glory* are in fact almost certainly of a secondary nature and depend ultimately upon the saying at the Trial. This does nothing, of course, to settle its interpretation, but it does mean that conclusions drawn from these other sayings cannot be allowed to determine our judgment of its original meaning.

Of these other sayings the two main ones are Mk 8^{38} and Mk $13^{26.2}$. The former runs:

> For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of man also be ashamed, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.

Now this saying is also represented in the Q tradition in Mt $10^{32f.}$ = Lk $12^{8f.}$ But it is significant that here the reference to the *Parousia* ('when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels') is missing. In what is probably its more original form, that of Lk $12^{8f.}$, it reads:

> Every one who acknowledges me before men, the Son of man also will acknowledge before the angels of God; but he who denies me before men will be denied before the angels of God.

As Dr. T. F. Glasson has said (*The Second Advent*, 75), it is difficult to see any reason why the community tradition should have reduced the Markan version to what we have in the other source. On the other hand, there are parallels enough for the reverse process, of *Parousia* sayings created by the Church out of ones that originally contained no reference to it.[3] And in this case there seems to be a progressive heightening of apocalyptic from Q, through Mark, to Matthew. For Matthew (16^{27}) omits the original saying at this point altogether

[1] *The Parables of Jesus*, tr. S. H. Hooke [S.C.M., 1954].

[2] For the rest, Mt 16^{28} ('Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom') is a clear modification of Mk 9^{1}, which contains no reference to the coming of the Son of man. The introduction to Mt 19^{28} ('Truly, I say unto you, in the new world, when the Son of man shall sit on his glorious throne') is, I believe, demonstrably editorial, as is that of Mt 25^{31} ('When the Son of man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, then he will sit on his glorious throne'). See my article 'The "Parable" of the Sheep and the Goats,' in *New Testament Studies*, II. iv. [May, 1956].

[3] *E.g.*, in the very next verse, Mt 16^{28} out of Mk 9^{1}; also Mt 24^{3} out of Mk 13^{4}; and, I believe, in Lk 23^{42}, the reading 'Remember me when you come *in* your kingdom' out of (the more original?) 'Remember me when you come *into* your kingdom' (cf. the third stage, in D, 'Remember me in the day of your coming').

and expands Mark's additional *Parousia* clause to form the main sentence :

For the Son of man is to come with his angels in the glory of his Father, and then he will repay every man for what he has done.

In view of this (and indeed of other arguments), it would appear improbable that the reference to the coming of the Son of man in glory is here original to Jesus. If it were, I should take it to mean (for Jesus, if not for the Evangelist) what I believe it to mean in the Trial saying (namely, a coming *into* the Father's glory). But in any case it is clearly not firm enough, critically speaking, to *controvert* any interpretation which this latter saying may of itself demand.

The other reference to the coming of the Son of man in glory is that of Mk 13^{26} and parallels :

And then they will see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory.

It is impossible to enter here into the vexed question of the structure and authenticity of this apocalyptic discourse. But there is virtual unanimity that, if later composition is to be found in the chapter at all, it is in the paragraph in which these words occur. It contains the suspicious transition from the second person plural to the written style of ' when they see.' Moreover, this section (Mk 13^{24-27}) is a pastiche of Old Testament allusions, to which Matthew and Luke in their turn have added. This is not how Jesus elsewhere uses Scripture. But it is exactly how we know the Church proceeded when it turned its hand to composing apocalypses ; for 2 Th 1^{8-10} represents a patchwork of precisely the same kind. The inclusion among these Scriptural allusions of Dn 7^{13}, with its reference to the coming of the Son of man on the clouds, is doubtless due to the fact that Jesus was remembered to have quoted it.[1] But the whole impression of these verses is of a secondary compilation on which it is impossible to rely for any fresh or independent evidence of how Jesus Himself thought.

This discussion has done no more than focus attention upon the decisive character of our main text. Even if it does not stand alone, it would, critically speaking, be unjustifiable to bring to its elucidation presuppositions derived from these other passages. It must be appraised and interpreted on its own merits, and, in the first instance, in the light of its evident Old Testament background.

Jesus' answer contains an echo of two Scriptural passages, whose meaning would not be lost upon His audience. The first is the opening verse of Ps 110, which, according to Mk 12^{36}, He had recently used to some effect upon the Scribes :

The Lord said to my Lord, Sit at my right hand, till I put thy enemies under thy feet.

This speaks of a verdict of vindication pronounced by God and of a promise to His servant of triumph out of the power of his enemies. In saying that His adversaries will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, Jesus is clearly claiming that God is going to vindicate Him by a similar act of crowning deliverance.

The second half of His statement, that the Son of man would come with the clouds of heaven, is an even clearer echo of Dn 7^{13} :

I saw in the night visions, and behold, with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man, and he came to the Ancient of Days and was presented before him.

Now this also, and the entire chapter from which it comes, is a classic passage of vindication. In the vision, the figure of a man, representing, after the beastlike figures of the four world empires, ' the saints of the most High,' is brought out of humiliation and defeat to the judgment seat of God, there to be ' given judgment ' and ' receive the kingdom ' and ' the dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven.' There could hardly be a setting more dramatically appropriate for Jesus' quotation. At the very moment when His enemies have finally ' prevailed ' over Him and set up their court to condemn Him, Jesus declared that judgment is to be given, not for them, but for the saints of the most High, embodied in His own person as Son of man. For out of suffering and death He is about to be brought to the throne of God, in a crowning act of vindication that they themselves will witness.

If this passage stood by itself, there could, I think, be no doubt that such was Jesus' meaning when He combined these words of Daniel with the opening verse of the coronation Psalm. There is every presumption, till we have reason to think otherwise, that He understood them in the sense in which they were written, and, as far as we know, had always been understood, to speak, that is, of a coming of the Son of man *to* God in ascent and vindication. And the context in which He cites them fully confirms this presumption. In other words, the two predictions of ' sitting at the right hand of God ' and ' coming on the clouds of heaven ' are to be seen as parallel expressions, static and dynamic, of the same assertion. Jesus is not at this point speaking of a coming from God :

[1] If something like Mk 14^{62} is not authentic, then it is difficult to see how it got into the tradition ; for, as we know, the Church itself had no theology of ' the Son of man.'

n whatever other sayings He may refer to the visitation of the Son of man, here, at any rate, He is affirming His vindication.[1]

Moreover, the impression that Mark leaves upon us is one of *imminent* vindication: the Sanhedrin is about to witness a dramatic reversal of judgment, such as Dn 7 pictures with the intervention of God. No time is specified, but it would be natural to assume (as it always has been assumed in regard to the session at God's right hand) that Jesus is here referring to the same moment of vindication out of suffering which earlier He had described, when not in the context of the law-court, in language reminiscent rather of the suffering Servant, whose Divine destiny was also to 'be exalted and lifted up and be very high' (Is 52^{13}). The saying at the Trial would then simply take up, and crown, those other prophecies of vindication which sound like a knell through the second half of Mark's Gospel:

> The Son of man will be delivered into the hands of men, and they will kill him; and when he is killed, after three days he will rise.[2]

And in these sayings the phrase, 'after three days,' if not written in subsequently, is to be taken as an expression for *speedy* and certain restoration, as in Hosea's promise to Israel:

> After two days he will revive us; and on the third day he will raise us up, that we may live before him.[3]

The natural supposition, therefore, from Mark's account is that Jesus spoke of an *immediate* vindication of Himself and His cause, out of the very jaws of humiliation and defeat. Indeed, if the whole saying is one of vindication, if the sitting and the coming have the same reference, there is really no alternative.

Furthermore, if we turn to the Matthean and Lukan versions of the Trial saying, we are at once struck by the fact that in each of them there is introduced a qualifying phrase, whose effect is to put beyond doubt that what they describe is to take place 'from this moment.' Matthew 26^{64} reads: 'From now on (ἀπ' ἄρτι) you will see the Son of man sitting at the right of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven'; and Lk 22^{69}: 'From now on (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν) the Son of man shall be seated at the right hand of the power of God.' This concurrence between the two Evangelists is remarkable, if, as I am convinced, both are working from Mark and working independently. And it is made the more interesting by the fact that this same verse contains two further agreements of Matthew and Luke over against Mark. Both the other Evangelists record an evasive rather than a direct answer to the question, 'Are you the Christ?', and both have a 'but' between the two halves of Jesus' reply (where Mark has a simple 'and'). The sense then becomes: 'Are you the Christ?' 'That is your term. But what you *will* see, and see at once, is the vindication of the Son of man. (For, to the Son of man, the suffering and death are but the gate to glory).'

But how are we to explain these agreements? There is clearly no later assimilation of the text from one to the other, as the actual wording in the Greek is different in each instance. That both independently are altering Mark is twice as difficult as the supposition that Matthew is here altering Mark, which I regard as frankly incredible. I cannot believe that Matthew, at the time at which he was writing, could have any conceivable motive in deliberately making ambiguous an unequivocal claim by Jesus to be the Christ, the very title round which his Gospel is written, and whose attribution by Peter he acclaims unequivocally in the closely parallel scene of $16^{16f.}$ Nor can I think that Matthew, whose every tendency in matters of eschatology is towards a futurist apocalyptic, should deliberately have added to Mark a phrase which would make the coming of Jesus on the clouds into an event occurring from the very moment of the Passion; for he has spent the whole of the two previous chapters picturing it as happening only at 'the consummation of the age.' That he should have retained the phrase 'from now on' had he found it in Mark is just credible; for Matthew is more of a collector than a consistent theologian, and a number of unresolved conceptions lie together in his Gospel.[4]

But, if he did not modify the confession or add the 'henceforth,' what is the alternative? Is there any evidence that these did in fact once stand in Mark and that that is where he derived them? The answer is that there is. The textual support for these variants is, to be sure, quite insufficient to establish the case by itself. But with all the other considerations, it is, in my judgment, probable that Mark may originally have written:

[1] The history of this interpretation (strongly advocated by Glasson, *op. cit.*, 63–68, and accepted by V. Taylor, *St. Mark, ad loc.*) is sketched by G. R. Beasley-Murray (*Jesus and the Future*, 259). His attempt to discredit it is unconvincing. The important point is not whether in Daniel the scene is laid in heaven or on earth: the locus of an apocalyptic vision, like that of a dream, is, literally, neither here nor there. What is indisputable is that it is a scene of vindication and that the one like a son of man comes *to* the Ancient of Days.

[2] Mk 9^{31} (the form showing least sign of embellishment); also 8^{31} 10^{33} *f.*

[3] Hos 6^{2}. Cf. Dodd, *op. cit.*, 99 f., 103.

[4] *E.g.*, 10^{23} 24^{30} and 28^{20}.

You have said that I am ; *but from now on* you will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.[1]

If so, all that Matthew has then done is to copy Mark, pruning his style, as his custom is, by cutting the cumbersome phrase ' You have said that I am ' to ' You have said.'

This gives a perfectly rational explanation of how Matthew comes to have what he has. Moreover there are obvious reasons why, in the text of Mark, the Messianic claim should later have been rendered unambiguous, and, by the simple omission of ' from now on,' the words about coming on the clouds been brought into line with the prediction of the previous chapter (13^{26}) that it is only at ' the End ' that the Son of man will be seen coming in glory.

The question of Luke's version is complicated by the fact that all through his Passion narrative we cannot be sure whether he is copying Mark or using a tradition of his own. In fact, at this point he appears to be doing both, reproducing two replies of Jesus to two questions about His Messiahship. The first, ' If I tell you, you will not believe ; and if I ask you, you will not answer ' ($22^{67f.}$), seems to come from a tradition also reflected in the Fourth Gospel.[2] The second, ' You say that I am ' (22^{70}), comes, I suggest, from Mark, and corroborates the argument that this is what Mark originally had. In the matter that immediately concerns us, I believe that Luke, like Matthew, has derived his ' henceforth ' from Mark, changing *ἀπ' ἄρτι* to *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* in accord with his regular stylistic preference.[3] His marked omission of the coming on the clouds, confining Jesus' prophecy simply to the session at God's right hand, merely reveals him as a consistent theologian, since for him Christ's enthronement did indeed take place from the Resurrection onwards, but His coming is reserved for the future. This again I believe to be a credible account of Luke's text. But wherever he derived his ' henceforth,' the conclusion is the same. Either it stood in Mark, or he took it from another source, which is then independent evidence for a tradition that Jesus explicitly used some such expression.

But, whether or not Jesus thus put the matter beyond doubt, it seems clear that what He was asserting, and what even our present text of Mark implies, was the *immediate* vindication of His Person and cause. In any case, what is most important is what is most certain : that we have here a saying not of visitation from God but of vindication by God.

What is important is *not* that ' the coming on the clouds ' means an ascent rather than a descent. This aspect is not stressed either in Daniel or in the saying of Jesus.[4] Such spatial terms are, in any case, only an accommodation of language, and it is finally of no significance whether man is conceived as coming to God or God coming to man.[5] The importance is that, if this is a saying of vindication, then there can be no doubt that it refers to the only moment to which all the enthronement language, when applied to Jesus, does refer, namely, to the moment of the Resurrection onwards : for there is never a suggestion that Jesus enters upon His triumph only at some *second* coming. If, on the other hand, it is language of visitation, then for us, as for important strands of the New Testament, its reference is to say the least ambiguous. We naturally then associate it with another, still future, moment, as does the Apostles' Creed when it actually introduces *a change of tense* between the ' sitting ' and the ' coming.' And how deep is the influence of liturgical repetition is plain when so good an exegete as Professor Cullmann can write : ' In his answer to the high priest, Jesus distinguishes between the moment when the Son of man will sit at the right hand of God and the one when he will come again on the clouds of heaven ' (*Peter*, 201). Of course, He does nothing of the sort.

In conclusion, it should be emphasized again that this is not to say that the expectation of a Second Coming had no place in the mind of Jesus. There are other sayings, of the coming of the Son of man in visitation, which would require to be examined in much greater detail before any such conclusion could be drawn. Moreover, the question would then have to be faced as to why the Church entertained this expectation so vividly if it did not derive from her Master. Again, we have not asked

[1] *σὺ εἶπας ὅτι* is read by *θ*, fam. 13, 472, 543, 565, 700, 1071 ; geo., arm. ; Origin. *ἀπ' ἄρτι* is represented in sy^s and sa (1 ms.). The case for the former is accepted by V. Taylor (*St. Mark, ad loc.* ; cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lix. 150) ; that for the latter is forcefully argued by Glasson (*op. cit.*, 66–68).

[2] Jn $10^{24f.}$: ' If you are the Christ, tell us plainly.' Jesus answered them, ' I told you, and you do not believe.'

[3] Luke never uses *ἀπ' ἄρτι*, Matthew never *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*.

[4] In the pre-Maccabean (?) section of Enoch, from which the scene in Dn 7 may well be derived, the idea of ascent is unambiguous : ' Behold, in the vision clouds invited me . . . and the winds in the vision caused me to fly and lifted me upward, and bore me into heaven ' (14^{8}). As evidence of how, later, it was clearly understood in terms of ascent, cf. 2 Esd 13^{3}.

[5] In Dn 7 itself we have both representations : ' There came one like a son of man, and he came to the Ancient of Days ' (*v.* 13) and ' Until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given for the saints of the most High ' (*v.* 22).

why the Evangelists themselves undoubtedly viewed the coming on the clouds as a separate and still future descent. We have sought simply to uncover the original meaning of the saying before us. And that, by itself, I believe admits of less doubt than many of the 'difficult or perplexing texts' which it is the purpose of this series to reconsider. The difficulty here arises not so much from what Jesus said but from what the Church has made of Him.

In preaching it is impossible to isolate this text for exposition—if only because of what the Church and the Creeds have made of it. But when it is seen in its original meaning, there is equally no need to isolate it. For its connexions then become apparent with another set of Gospel sayings, like those of Mt 28^{20} and Jn 14^{18-23} where the *Parousia* is viewed rather as a continuing Presence inaugurated by the Passion, a coming of Christ in power *from that moment on*. This understanding, and with it the whole eschatology of the Fourth Gospel, I now believe to lie very near to the teaching of Jesus, before it became invested in what Dr. Vincent Taylor has described as 'the glittering robe of apocalyptic.' And for the conception of the coming of Christ, like the session of Christ, 'from now on,' the saying at the Trial is the most important, and the most impregnable, witness.

Contributions and Comments

A Note on John i. 3

1. St. Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria (+328) is sometimes quoted as the first ecclesiastical writer to join ὃ γέγονεν to Jn 1^3 instead of to 1^4 (*Epistola*, i. 4, preserved by Theodoret, *Ecclesiastica Historia*, bk. 1, c.4 [alii 3]).[1] This is, in fact, the text as given in Theodoret's work by the codex Vaticanus 628 s.XI and the Marcianus 344 s.XIII (=Theodorus Lector), and as quoted in Latin by Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita*, bk. 1, c.14, 16 (*CSEL*, lxxi. 56), and as reprinted in St. Alexander's Fragments by J.-P. Migne (*PG*, xviii. 553A); while the rest of the codices, most of which are older than the two mentioned, omit ὃ γέγονεν, as do also the editions of L. Parmentier (*GCS* xii. [Leipzig, 1911], 12), and J. L. Schultze (*PG*, lxxxii. 893B). The same applies to H. G. Opitz, in his collection of documents illustrating the history of Arius and his heresy (Athanasius, *Werke*, III. i. [Berlin/Leipzig, 1934], 22). It would, therefore, appear that St. Alexander's text should best be omitted from the list of witnesses in favour of the reading referred to.

There seems to be no reason to suspect Theodoret of having rendered St. Alexander's text according to his own view on the partition of verses in Jn $1^{3f.}$; firstly, because he is quoting a document (although this is not to be stressed with regard to ancient compilers and translators; see on Rufinus below); and, secondly, because he himself seems to have had no definite view on the subject. While there are indeed several instances where he quotes Jn 1^3, ending with οὐδὲ ἕν or οὐδέν, there are others ending with ὃ γέγονεν, and no variants listed. For the former reading, see *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, bk. vi. c.60 (ed. J. Raeder [Lipsiae 1904], 169; cf. *PG*, lxxxiii. 977A); *Eranistes*, dial. ii. (*PG*, lxxxiii. 141A); *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, bk. v. c.4 (*ib.*, 461C.); *In Psalmum* ii. 8 (*PG*, lxxx. 880B); for the latter *In Psalmum* xxxii. 6 (*ib.*, 1096C); *Epistola* 151 (*PG*, lxxxiii. 1420C). Once he seems even to begin *v.* 4 with: Ζωὴ ἦν (*Eranistes*, dial. II [*PG*, lxxxiii. 109B]). Further critical editions of Theodoret's works will, of course, shed further light on this point.

As for the two codices that have ὃ γέγονεν, they might well have been influenced by the reading commonly adopted among the Greeks since St. John Chrysostom (+407; Theodorus Lector s.VI), while Cassiodorus might have yielded to St. Jerome's influence, who strongly favoured the longer text in Jn 1^3 (*Homilia in Joannem Evangelistam*, i. 1–14; ed. G. Morin, *Anecdota Maredsolana*, III. ii. 387s).[2]

2. There is, however, another old witness to the reading in question, a witness which seems to my knowledge to have escaped the commentators' attention, but might well take over the place of first *known* witness to that reading. There is, in fact, a quotation of Jn 1^3 in the dialogue *De Recta in Deum Fide*, attributed to one Adamantius, ending with ὃ γέγονεν and no variants being listed (bk. iv. c.4; ed. W. H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen, *GCS*, xiii. [Leipzig, 1901] 172; cf. *PG*, xi. 1829C). Rufinus, though, in his Latin translation of the Dialogue ends the quotation in *factum est nihil*, where we have a good instance of the liberty taken by some of the ancients in the rendering of works (*ib.*, 173; cf. C. P. Caspari, *Kirchengeschichtliche Anecdota*, i. [Christiania, 1883] 96).

[1] See Th. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* $^{5-6}$ [Leipzig, 1921], 710; E. C. Hoskyns—F. N. Davey, *The Fourth Gospel* [2] [London, 1947 (1950)], 142; M.-E. Boismard, *Le Prologue de saint Jean* (*Lectio Divina*, XI), [Paris, 1953], 27.

[2] The same editor shows that Cassiodorus knew at least two of the pieces newly identified by him as belonging to St. Jerome and published in the volume mentioned; cf. *Études, Textes, Découvertes*, i. [Abbaye de Maredsous 1913], 225s. 231.

The text of Adamantius might at the same time open a new line of inquiry into the question of the partition of verses in Jn $1^{3f.}$ If indeed the Dialogue originates from Syria, and is prior to A.D. 311,[1] there can be no question of the above-mentioned reading having first been adopted at Alexandria at the time of Arius, in order to refute his doctrine on Christ, as seems to be inferred by some commentators from St. Ambrose, *In Psalmum* xxxvi. 35 (*PL*, xiv. [1845] 984C). The Dialogue would then not only be prior to Arius and to St. Alexander's Letter, as well as alien to their country, but it deals furthermore with quite another set of heretics, namely the followers of Marcion, Bardesanes and Valentinus. The Gnostics, indeed, as well as the Arians and Manichaeans (according to St. Ambrose, *De Fide*, bk. iii. 41s [*PL*, xvi. [1845] 598A/B] and St. Augustine, *In Joannem*, Tract., i. 16 [*PL*, xxxv. 1387]), followed throughout the reading : *Quod factum est in ipso, vita erat.*

3. To the Gnostics commonly quoted as instances for that partition of verses in Jn $1^{3f.}$ (see Th. Zahn, *ib.*, 708 f.), there might be added an hitherto unknown Gnostic work from Egypt, preserved in Coptic and published in German by C. Schmidt (*Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften*, I. [*GCS*, xxii.] [Leipzig, 1905], 340, 343), quoted already by Th. Calmes (*L'Evangile selon Saint Jean* [Paris, 1904], 4) ; while to the list of witnesses supporting Adamantius' reading there should be added another apparently forgotten text, namely, *Pap. Oxyr.* 1151, lin. 22, a Christian amulet attributed to the fifth century A.D., published and commented on by A. S. Hunt (*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, viii. [London, 1911], 252s), and Ch. Wessely (*Les plus anciens monuments du Christianisme écrits sur papyrus*, ii. Patr. Or. 18, 418). This would help to bear out St. Ambrose's statement, that this reading was adopted by the *Alexandrini et Aegyptii* (*In Psalmum* xxxvi. 35 (*PL*, xiv. (1845) 984B/C]), even if this text should prove to be posterior to St. Ambrose.

JOHN MEHLMANN

Rome

Peter's Denial—Mark xiv. 68, Luke xxii. 57

οὔτε οἶδα οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι σὺ τί λέγεις (Mk 14^{68}).
οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν, γύναι (Lk 22^{57}).

DR. BLACK (*An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 61) suggests that the Marcan and Lucan renderings are both differing translations of an identical original Aramaic which contained the ambiguous and indeclinable particle d^e. Mark mistranslated by rendering it as a neuter, *τί*, while Luke correctly translated it by a masculine pronoun. He finds the reply of Peter in Mark's account ' a curious statement for Peter to make.'

There are two reasons why it appears that his solution should be rejected. Firstly, the theory of an ambiguous Aramaic original is only possible if the true parallel of Mk 14^{68} is Lk 22^{57}. But an examination of the Greek text shows that Luke has the Marcan form of the denial at 22^{60}, which is the real parallel to Mk 14^{68}, while 22^{57} is really parallel to Mk 14^{71}. If this point be admitted, then the Lucan change of order is editorial and secondary and the case for mistranslation fails.

Secondly, if we take the Marcan account seriously as a faithful record of how it all happened, Peter's first reply to the maid's question may not seem as ' curious ' as it does to the expert linguist with his critical demand for logical consistency. For in daily life people who are suddenly and unwillingly subjected to cross examination usually avoid answering directly. The more unexpected the unwelcome question, the more clumsy any attempt to hedge is likely to be. Peter must have been under considerable stress at the time. The urge to loyalty and the memory of his public avowal, ' Even if I must die, I will never deny you ' (*v.* 31), was opposed by the acute awareness of personal peril, bewilderment at the catastrophe of Jesus' arrest and the apparent failure of all the glorious hopes for the kingdom of God. Such a tension would have been too harrowing to permit clear thought and logical replies. Mark's account reveals a progress in the degree of Peter's defection which rings so true psychologically that it suggests an actual occurrence rather than mere literary art. On this view, *v.* 68 is a blustering attempt to avoid arrest and actual denial of Jesus. The disciple is still struggling to be faithful. But his second denial brings home to him his failure and the third denial (*v.* 71) has all the extravagance of weakness and despair.

On these grounds we reject Dr. Black's conclusion that ' Mark is certainly interpreting his tradition and here wrongly.'

W. J. PETER BOYD

Devizes, Wilts

Tertullian and Pseudonymity

IN his article on ' The Authorship of the Epistle to the Ephesians ' (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxvii. [April, 1956] 197) Dr. C. Leslie Mitton appeals to Tertullian as a witness to the legitimacy of pseudonymity, citing the words, ' It is allowable that that which pupils publish should be regarded as their master's work ' (*Adv. Marcion*, iv. 5). But does this statement support pseudonymity as Dr. Mitton supposes ?

[1] As maintained by A. v. Harnack, *Marcion* [2] (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, xlv.) [Leipzig, 1924], 59*, 344* ; Th. Zahn, ' Die Dialoge des "Adamantius" mit den Gnostikern,' *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, ix. [1887–8], 236–238 ; W. H. van der Sande Bakhuyzen, *ib.*, xvi ; J. Quasten, *Patrology*, ii. [Utrecht, 1953], 146s, etc.

Reference to the context of Tertullian's statement on this important matter reveals the following significant factors. (i) He is dealing with the question of the Authority of those Canonical books of the New Testament (and particularly the Gospels) which were received not only by him personally but generally by the churches. His method of reasoning is clearly seen in the following passage—' If it is acknowledged that that is more true which is more ancient, that more ancient which is even from the beginning, that from the beginning which is from the Apostles; it will in like manner assuredly be acknowledged that that has been derived by tradition from the Apostles which has been preserved inviolate in the churches of the Apostles ' (*Adv. Marcion*, iv. 5). (ii) Having mentioned some of the Pauline churches and the value of their testimony, he proceeds to the Gospels, dealing first with the Gospel of Luke and then commenting—' the same authority of the Apostolic churches will uphold the other Gospels which we have in due succession through them and according to their usage, I mean those of Matthew and John: although that which was published by Mark may also be maintained to be Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was: for the narrative of Luke also is generally ascribed to Paul: it is allowable that that which pupils publish should be regarded as their master's work.' The statement in question, therefore, applied originally to the cases of Mark and Luke, and the meaning of the words must clearly be sought in the context.

Tertullian's words in no way suggest that Mark and Luke were not the recognized authors of the respective Gospels, nor that the churches had received them as the works of the Apostles Peter and Paul. These Gospels were never pseudonymous, and it is therefore difficult to see how a statement applied to them could be claimed as support for pseudonymity. The key to Tertullian's meaning can be found in the first passage quoted above. The urge to establish the apostolicity of these writings was in order to prove their antiquity, on which basis canonicity was established. If Mark and Luke can be shown to have direct connexions with the Apostles Peter and Paul, their authenticity is indisputably vindicated. It is important to notice, therefore, that Tertullian's argument does not seek to establish their authority but to confirm it. He writes, in fact, against heretics and is seeking to draw a clear line of demarcation between the Canonical Gospels and the later forgeries (*posteritati falsariorum*).

An interesting illustration of Tertullian's principle is found in Origen's approach to the Epistle to the Hebrews. While admitting the thoughts to be the Apostle's, Origen considered the diction and composition to be ' that of some one who recorded from memory the Apostle's teaching, and, as it were, illustrated with a brief commentary the sayings of his master. If then any church hold this Epistle to be Paul's, we cannot find fault with it for so doing; for it was not without good reason that the men of old time have handed it down as Paul's ' (Eusebius, *H.E.*, vi. 25). But the Epistle to the Hebrews was not a pseudonymous work, and Origen's application of the principle no more than Tertullian's statement of it could legitimately be summoned as a witness in support of authorised pseudonymous practice.

With great deference, therefore, to Dr. Mitton's opinion, I would suggest it is precarious for him to base his justification of pseudonymity on such an insecure foundation. His own theory of the origin of Ephesians involves a different proposition from that envisaged by Tertullian, since the pupil's publication was apparently not merely ' regarded ' as his master's work, but was actually published in his master's name. The former would be the collective opinion of the Church, but the latter would be the author's own literary device. DONALD GUTHRIE

Stanmore, Middlesex

Theology as Evangelism

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May, 1956 [lxvii. 227], you draw attention to the Rev. B. M. G. Reardon's splendid article on this topic. Your readers may care to have their attention drawn further to T. M. Lindsay's description of Martin Luther as a teacher of theology (*The Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 118–119):

' From the first Luther's lectures differed from what were then expected from a professor of theology. It was not that he criticized the theology then current in the Church; he had an entirely different idea of what theology ought to be, and of what it ought to make known. His whole habit of mind was practical, and theology for him was an ' experimental ' discipline. It ought to be, he thought, a study which would teach how a man could find the grace of God, and, having found it, how he could persevere in a life of joyous obedience to God and His commandments. . . . It was a task to which contemporary theology had not given any special prominence, and which, in Luther's opinion, it had ignored. His theology was new, because in his opinion it ought to be occupied with a new task, not because the conclusions reached by contemporary theology occupied with other tasks were necessarily wrong.'

It is not strange that with the resurgence of interest in Reformed theology there should come a fresh appraisement of the task of the theological professor in so remarkably similar terms.

London J. ITHEL JONES

Important and Influential Foreign Books[1]

Martin Dibelius' 'Studies in Acts'

By the Reverend C. S. C. Williams, M.A., Merton College, Oxford

The translation by Mary Ling of Martin Dibelius' *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte* brings to English readers a collection of essays which have had a considerable influence on scholars since the first essay appeared in 1923 on the *Style Criticism of the Book of Acts*, the first in this book; others are *Paul on the Areopagus* [1938–39], *Paul in Athens* [1939], *The Text of Acts* [1941], *The Apostolic Council* [1947], *The Acts of the Apostles as an Historical Source* [1945], *The Conversion of Cornelius* [1947], *The First Christian Historian* [1946–47], *The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography* [1944 but published in 1949], *The Acts of the Apostles in the setting of Early Christian Literature* (hitherto unpublished) and *Paul in the Acts of the Apostles* (unfinished). As an instance of the very marked influence of Dibelius' views, one may cite the article of the Rev. C. F. Evans in the *Journal of Theological Studies, N.S.* vii, pt. i [1956], 25–41, who acknowledges his indebtedness to the ninth essay in this book.

These essays should certainly be read even though many of them are outdated and though in this collection of them a certain amount of tiresome repetition is inevitable. In place of this repetition, one would have welcomed a translation of the brief discussion of the date and authorship of Acts by Dibelius in his *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur* [1926], i, 45–47 and ii, 98f., 101. We have to assume that Luke is the author of Acts and that he wrote *c.* A.D. 90, the date to which Dibelius assigns Acts and the latest possible one consistent with Lucan authorship and Lucan independence of Josephus' *Antiquities*. One is given the impression that questions of date and authorship are really unimportant but that elbow-room, as it were, must be left to oral tradition to have free play between A.D. 70 and 90.

Not only in the first essay in 1923 but always Dibelius took a Form-critical approach to the Book of Acts. He treated it as a literary-theological document, not historical in the ordinary sense but only historical in the light that it throws on the needs of Christian readers *c.* A.D. 90. Form-criticism has its weakness as well as its strength, and we are in a better position now than Dibelius was in 1923 to assess both. It may be that even in 1947 he was too sure of its strength when he wrote: 'The form-critical method uses the form and style of the tradition in order to draw conclusions about it as to its origin and the conditions out of which it arose, and in this way seeks observations which are universally valid in order to establish less subjective criteria of the tradition's historicity, criteria which can be verified at any time' (p. 102f.). Against such a view one might set the arguments of the late Professor M. Goguel in the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, xciv. [1926], 114–160; L. J. McGinley, *Form-criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives* [1944]; C. H. Dodd's article in *The Expository Times*, xliii. [1931–32], 396–400, which Professor Nineham has not overthrown in his *Studies in the Gospels*, 223ff.; R. P. Casey in *Quantulacumque* [1937], 114f.; cf. A. H. McNeile, *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament* [1953], 46–58 and T. W. Manson, in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: Studies in honour of C. H. Dodd* [1956], 211–221. Dibelius assumes that 'The speeches answer the question: how is one to speak? and not the question: how did that man speak at that time? Thus, for literary reasons, the Areopagus speech must be regarded as a composition of the author of Acts . . .' (p. 70f.).

The second, third and ninth essays go together. They have been answered and, in the opinion of the present writer, refuted completely by B. Gärtner, 'The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation' in *Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, xxi.* [1955]. Dibelius makes this speech in Ac 17 a collection of ideas, lacking homogeneity, based on the Stoic 'natural theology': Gärtner maintains its homogeneity and after a most minute and careful examination of the phrases used he concludes that it is Pauline and that it is concerned with the revelation of God to His people rather than with Stoic philosophy. He castigates Dibelius for neglecting the Jewish and Old Testament tradition of historiography and for reckoning only with the Hellenistic. Dibelius certainly admits that the meaning of Thucydides in his famous passage (bk. i, 22) is open to debate but in effect he assumes that the Greek tradition allowed Luke to compose speeches freely with little or no regard for the 'general sense.' The

[1] This is the last article in this earlier series. It was held over at the author's suggestion until the book had become available in its English translation.

views of Pohlenz and of Gomme upon the methods and aims of Thucydides are not considered. By literary critical methods 'contradictions' are found in Acts which are supposed to justify the description 'unhistorical' except that the material reflects the 'history' of the Christians or their needs about A.D. 90. On this view the Areopagus speech becomes 'a symbol of Christian theology in the environment of Greek culture.'

The essay on *The Text of Acts*, translated by Paul Schubert, appeared in the *Journal of Religion* in 1941. It is a 'brief sketch' (p. 92) and in view of the work done on this subject by J. H. Ropes, in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, pt. i, vol. iii, [1926] and by K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury, *ib.*, vol. iv. [1933]; by A. C. Clark, *The Acts of the Apostles* [1933]; and by M. J. Lagrange, *Critique Textuelle*, ii: *La critique rationelle*, it is very slight. There is no reference to the Western papyri of Acts or even to the Chester Beatty papyrus. But this sketch is of interest because it gives reasons for encouraging the conjectural emendation of the text; none of the emendations advanced, however, is convincing.

In the essay on the Apostolic Council, Dibelius asks, 'Why do we hear nothing of what Paul and Barnabas say? There seems to be only one answer—because God's acts in the mission to the Gentiles have already been related, not in this gathering of the apostles, but in the Book of Acts. . . . Thus . . . we are led to see that the portrayal of the Apostolic Council in Ac 15 is a literary rendering, and is significant as such, but not in its understanding of historical events.' Yet to give this as the only answer is to suggest a short and easy way with the works of scholars like K. Lake, in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, pt. i. vol. v. [1933], note xvi., or J. R. Porter, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, xlvii. [1946] 169–174 or T. W. Manson, in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xxiv. [1940] 59–80, who have gone carefully into the question of the historicity of Ac 15 and who without being blindly conservative have not dismissed this chapter as though it had merely a literary-theological value.

In discussing Acts as an historical source (pp. 102ff.) Dibelius shows that he regards it as the main object of the book 'to preach and to show what the Christian belief is and what effects it has.' He thinks that two books, Luke and Acts, cannot both have been dedicated to Theophilus without the name of the author being known and that we may assume that Luke was the author, but contrary to usual assumptions, this, he would say, does not settle the question of historicity. He thinks that Luke used an itinerary of wider scope than the 'we-sections' and without the sea-voyage into which the name of Paul has been inserted! Much is made of the fact that we are not told at the end of ch. 27 what Paul does. (But surely he was among the 'all' saved then! How? On a plank? Or by pick-a-back? Does it matter?) His reference in this essay, dated 1947, to the similarity between Paul's and Peter's speeches disregards the well known work of C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Development* [1936], or of Bo Reicke in *The Root of the Vine*, edited by A. Fridrichsen [1953]. Mr. Evans allows for kerygmata, though not for the primitive pattern of an Apostolic Kerygma. But Dibelius ignored the latter entirely.

Stephen's speech in Ac 7 is assumed to be irrelevant to its context (p. 167). Dibelius says, 'It is, indeed, impossible to find a connexion between the account of the history of Israel to the time of Moses (7^{2-19}) and the accusation against Stephen; nor is any accusation against the Jews, which would furnish the historical foundation for the attack at the end of the speech, found at all in this section.' It is true that this argument has been maintained for many years. F. J. Foakes Jackson (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, xlix. [1930], 283–286) thought that nothing would be lost by excision of this speech, neither Jesus nor the Messiah being mentioned. Here is a typical denunciation of the disobediences of the patriarchs, whose history in summary form was known to everyone. Cf. *The Beginnings of Christianity*, iv. 69 or Furneaux, *Acts* [1912], 90. But no account is taken of weighty arguments on the other side. The work of B. S. Easton in *The Purpose of Acts*, 47 ff., the brilliant article of R. P. C. Hanson in *Theology*, l. [1947] 142 ff. and the arguments of M. Simon (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, ii. [1951] 127–142) must all be taken now into account. It is clearer than when Dibelius wrote in 1944 that Stephen's speech proclaimed Jesus in His Old Testament types to be Saviour, Redeemer and Ruler of God's people, to be the true prophet and mediator between His people and God and to be the Righteous One. As Mr. Evans has argued (*Studies in the Gospels*, ed. D. E. Nineham [1955], 50) Luke arranged some of the material in the central section of his Gospel as he has, because he believed that Jesus was the prophet like unto Moses, of Dt $18^{15ff.}$. Again, the reference in 7^{45} to Joshua (*Ἰησοῦς*) taking possession of the nations would carry to Christian eyes or ears the meaning that the Gentiles belong to Jesus. R. B. Rackham had answered the charge of irrelevance against this speech in his Commentary as long ago as 1901.

Dibelius says of Paul's speech in Miletus to the elders of the Church in Ephesus, 20^{18-35} (p. 158): 'We can see that this speech could scarcely have been placed anywhere else; in all its parts it achieves a certain spiritual object which Luke

intended to achieve, just at the point where Paul laid down his missionary work in the East. This judgment is quite independent of our answer to the question, which can never be answered for certain, as to whether Paul spoke in Miletus at all and, if so, in what words.' He does not bring out, as F. F. Bruce does in his Commentary on Acts [1951], the wealth of Pauline phraseology in this speech. His argument could have been strengthened by an appeal to a type of Farewell Discourse, such as Munck has made (*Melanges Goguel*, 155–170). But even so, the ' Form ' cannot determine the historicity.

What Gomme (*Essays in Greek History and Literature*) is to Thucydides, Professor F. F. Bruce is to Luke (*The Speeches of Acts* [1942]). At the other extreme, as Grossinsky (*Das Programm des Thukydides* [1936]) maintained that Thucydides claimed for the reporting of speeches a considerable degree of subjectivity, so Dibelius assumes that Luke treated his material with complete feeedom, as though he felt no imposition of an objective bond in the sphere of the '*logoi*' as well as of the '*erga*.' The truth probably lies somewhere between the position of Bruce and that of Dibelius. The latter's *Studies in Acts* are worth reading because they present consistently and learnedly one point of view. But an approximation to the other point of view will probably be favoured by those who think that Sir William Ramsay did not work in vain and that the references in Acts to officials and other persons and to places have great historical value (cf. W. A. McDonald, in *The Biblical Archaeologist*, iii. [1940], 18–24, iv. [1941] 1–10, v. [1942], 36–48 and M. M. Parvis, in *ib.*, viii. [1945] 62–80); that questions of historicity cannot be separated from those of literary and theological exegesis; and that Form-criticism is a literary, not an historical instrument, and cannot be used for a final verdict on any section of the New Testament.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Seeing the Invisible

By the Reverend A. W. Heathcote, M.A., M.Sc., M.Th., Ph.D., Retford

'He endured, as seeing him who is invisible.'—He 11[27].

Seeing the invisible—seeing the things that cannot be seen—may appear to be a curious subject. But it is near to the interests of most boys.

There is, for example, that curious mixture which you may have tried to make, called invisible ink. When you have done your writing with it and the ink has dried there should be no mark at all to be seen on the paper. The writing only appears when the paper is treated in the proper way, perhaps when it is heated in front of the fire. Then the invisible words spring to light, and the person who shares the secret of the writing can read the message. The invisible has come to sight.

In 1609 in Italy one of the earliest scientific societies was founded. It was called the Academy of the Lynx. The lynx is an animal which is supposed to have very keen sight, and the name was chosen because the members of this society were interested in developing clear-sighted science, and in particular in the use of the newly invented microscope. With the microscope for the first time men could see things which before had been too small to be seen, or to be seen distinctly. They examined the eye of an insect and found that it was covered by a membrane ' perforated with holes like the iron visor of a warrior.' (They were looking at what we call the compound eye of an insect.) One of them discovered the fine tubes which take air into the bodies of insects. Another worker, this time in Holland, found a tiny insect living on a flea. We do not find it hard to believe in the reality of this world of tiny things, even if we ourselves have never handled a microscope.

Now there is an invisible thing of a different kind very near to us all the time. We depend upon it for our very existence. It is unseen, but not because it is too small. If you want to see it you must visit the physics department of a university. Somewhere, possibly in the basement of the building, you will find a room which contains a complicated apparatus—quite a Heath Robinson affair it seems—which provides you with . . . water. That is, it looks like water, when you turn on the tap and run it into your vacuum flask. But it is air, not water. The invisible air had been so cooled and compressed that it has turned into a liquid which can be seen and handled—with care!

We have been talking about bringing invisible things to sight, about seeing the invisible. But that is what Jesus came to do. One day Philip asked Jesus to show them God, and Jesus' reply was, ' He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' To have seen Jesus was to have seen God. By looking at Jesus we see exactly what God is like in His glory and goodness. By looking constantly at Jesus we are then able to live nobly and well, in

the way that Moses did long ago. For ' he endured, as seeing him who is invisible.'

Holidays

By the Reverend A. M. L. MacFarlan, M.C., M.A., Headmaster, St. Kentigern College, Pakuranga, Auckland

' Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth.'—Ec 12^1.

Boys and girls, I expect you are all enjoying your holidays to the full. It is a great thrill to be away from the routine of classes and lessons and to be free. You remember the story of the small boy who was asked what he liked best about his school and who replied ' Please, sir, the holidays.'

Some people, of course, think you get far too long holidays. I expect some of your Mothers agree with them before the end of August. I used to think that school holidays were really far too long, but of course now that I am a schoolmaster I don't think they are nearly long enough. But I was reading recently the life of an old Scots Professor which told of his school days nearly a hundred years ago. The only holidays he got were a week in July, two days at Easter, and two at Christmas.

When I was a recruit in the Army we used to be taught all sorts of drill movements—sloping arms, marching, marking time, turning about, and so on. At first the sergeant used to show us what to do, going over it again and again. Then he put us through it. Each part of the drill movement had to be done separately. If we were sloping arms, which has three movements, he would shout ' One ' —stop—' Two '—stop—' Three.' But after we had done it to his timing again and again and he thought we knew it, he would shout ' Now, carry on in your own time,' and we had to slope arms for ourselves.

That is what holidays are for. They are not a time when you can forget all you ever learned at school. It is a period when you carry on in your own time, when you try out for yourselves what you have been taught.

And that is what your holidays from Sunday School and Bible Class should mean also. Throughout the year in Sunday School and Bible Class your teachers have been telling you of the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. Now you are on holiday and you should be carrying on in your own time. You should be learning to follow Him in your own way and showing in your lives His influence and example. If you do that, all you have been taught about Jesus during the year will shine through your actions in this holiday time. Carry on in your own time.

The Christian Year

Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity

The Secret of Perpetual Youthfulness

By Principal H. F. Lovell Cocks, M.A., D.D., Bristol

' Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.'—Jn 3^3.

Some time ago I stayed in a house that was full of what is called ' contemporary furniture '—all angles and chromium. I decided that I did not like contemporary furniture, any more than I like contemporary art, of which there were some examples on the walls. And that set me thinking about my dislike of contemporary music and of my inability to make head or tail of contemporary poetry. And I came to the conclusion that I should have to take myself in hand. It is true, of course, that not everything new is either true, or beautiful. But it does not follow that everything whose novelty affronts me is necessarily bad, or ugly. If I find myself out of step with the contemporary world, it does not mean that the contemporary world is going to the dogs; it merely means that I am getting old, and that I had better do something about it before it is too late.

This mental stagnation is liable to happen to all of us. Not at first, of course. When we are young we manage to keep abreast of things. We come to terms with life. We become acclimatized to the world in which we are living. Gradually we acquire a set of ideas, based on experience, which enables us to master the art of day-to-day adaptation to events and circumstances. And as we grow more and more preoccupied with the business of the world and find that these ideas work tolerably well, we tend to settle down with this mental furniture for the rest of our lives. We begin to look with suspicion upon new ideas that threaten to disturb our stock beliefs. We become less and less ready to welcome what we do not immediately recognize and understand. Finally, what we call our principles and convictions are put beyond argument—and being unchallenged, degenerate into prejudices. And we fight to the death to keep them. We have stopped growing and we stagnate. The world in which our outward lives are spent becomes more and more strange to us—a foreign land where everything we meet is disconcerting and even frightening. Our minds live more and more in the past—in a world which, once real, is now as unsubstantial as a dream. And then, whatever our age according to the calendar, we are old; for we are decrepit in mind.

That was the trouble with Nicodemus. He was old. Not, perhaps, in years, but in heart and mind. He was a good man. There can be no question of that. He was one of the best of the Pharisees, and a worthy representative of the traditional religion. Compared with him the publicans and sinners with whom Jesus consorted were the very scum of the earth. Yet according to Jesus these same publicans and sinners were eagerly jostling their way into the Kingdom of God while Nicodemus and his like were dithering outside, unable to make up their minds to go in. The publicans and sinners lacked the sound principles by which the Pharisees lived. But by way of compensation they were free from the prejudices which blinded the eyes of the Pharisees to the manifest working of the power of God in the words and works of Jesus.

Nicodemus and his friends, being old, could not *see* the Kingdom of God. Now to 'see' the Kingdom of God means to share in it, to receive the rights of citizenship in it and to rejoice in its blessings. But when Jesus says that we must be born again if we are to see the Kingdom, He also means that apart from this new birth, so far from sharing in the Kingdom, we shall not even realize that the Kingdom is here. We shall not even see it—let alone enter it. For the Kingdom cometh not with observation—that is to say, with pomp and circumstance—its coming is not heralded by a procession in the streets with banners waving and brass bands playing. There is no publicity campaign to inaugurate it. The Kingdom of God comes in unlooked-for ways and in unexpected places. The King of all the worlds is born not in a royal palace but in a stable. The long looked-for Messiah of the Jewish people is found in despised Nazareth.

We often miss the signs of the Lord's appearing because we have become spiritually torpid and insensitive. We have closed our minds against new impressions. We are quite sure we know how the Lord will come, and our preconceived notions of what God ought to do blind us to what He is actually doing. In the name of orthodoxy we may be found resisting the Spirit of God, who can be most unorthodox in His manner of working. And so the Saviour comes—and we do not recognize Him. The Kingdom dawns on the world and our estranged faces miss the many-splendoured thing.

The remedy for this senescence of the human spirit with its attendant blindness is a radical one. 'Ye must be born again—born from above.' Now this regeneration is not something that takes place once for all. The same divine Spirit that gave us new life from the dead at our conversion, renews that life in us from day to day. And all of us need this prophylactic against spiritual old age. We are too apt to think of the new birth as something which happens right at the beginning of the Christian life, when the sinner by the grace of God steps out of the old life into the new. We think of him as loosed from the besetting sins that were the chains of his unregenerate days and henceforth living in the freedom of a Christian sonship. And this is a true enough picture, provided we remember that the renewing, life-giving work of the Holy Spirit never ceases to be necessary, however mature our Christian experience may be. We need not only to become, but to remain, like little children in our readiness to receive the gift of God and in our eagerness to welcome the new and unexpected in God's dealings with us. 'Behold, I make all things new.' Yes, and God keeps them new for us. The gospel never becomes a mere tale that is told. Saving grace never loses the bloom of its freshness or ceases to subdue us to a wondering adoration. And God renews our minds—especially our minds, so that we are able to think new thoughts concerning Him and to find yet more treasure in the old ones.

I want to stress this. The very gospel that saves us cannot be taken for granted. We know what it is. We can point to the Bible where it is set forth. We can even put it into our own words and preach it to men. Yet our very familiarity with the old, old story may rob it of its freshness and power. It may be merely the old, old story—a tale that is told—instead of good news. And when that happens we can no longer communicate it for we no longer live by it, or even understand it. What we call the problem of communication—the proclamation of the gospel to a generation that speaks another language than that of the Bible and lives in another world—would be far less daunting than it appears to be if the gospel were really good news to us who are its trustees. Yet it is we who have grown old and not the gospel. And it may very well be that because of the timidity and prejudices of old age we are unconsciously refusing the gospel admission into our lives. And we refuse it, not because it has lost its power to renew and save us—but because we do not want to be changed and shrink from the untried paths into which the gospel may direct us. And there is only one hope for us—to be born again.

'Come, Holy Ghost, our hearts inspire,' we sing. If we really mean that prayer when we pray it, we must stop putting obstacles in His way. We must understand and admit our need for His regenerating power. We must stop trying to be at ease in Zion, and realize that we all need a daily renewal. Not only the scallywags and the down-and-outs, but the good, respectable Church people need to be turned upside down and inside out by the revolutionary might of the Holy Spirit. Not

only the publicans and sinners but the Pharisees need the new birth. We all need to be confronted by the living God in order that we may live. For the doctrine of the Holy Spirit gives expression to the supreme fact of the contemporary God. The Father and Lord of all is not a dim character in the Old Testament. Jesus Christ is more than a figure in history. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever, and God is the living God who speaks His life-giving Word to us here and now. To understand this is to pray, not that we may be taken out of the world and saved from its frightening strangeness, but rather that we may be able to see God in whatever guise He appears and hear His call to us in the needs of our time and all the opportunities that we so easily miss. We must ask not for security, but for humility and charity and the faith that goes out at God's command, not knowing where it is going. This is the secret of the new birth and of perpetual youthfulness. This is the work of the Holy Spirit in your life and mine.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Sacrifice of Thanksgiving (Harvest)

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. KENT, M.A.,
CATHCART, GLASGOW

'When the Lord turned again the captivity of Zion, we were like them that dream. Then was our mouth filled with laughter, and our tongue with singing.'—Ps 126[1.2].

It was almost too good to be true. So long had the Jews suffered the ignominy and anguish of captivity that, when the hour of their liberation struck, they could hardly believe it to be a reality.

I once sat outside a gaol waiting for a prisoner to be released. The heavy doors swung open and the young man stepped out. He glanced round to see that they had really closed behind him, then he advanced a little and stood stock still. He gazed upward, turned his head slowly first to one side then to the other and took a long deep breath in a world no longer enclosed by imprisoning walls. The expression on his face told me what he was thinking. Was he free? Free? It was incredible, bewildering.

Just like the Jews. They were as men who dreamed. Not until they heard the voices of their pagan captors paying tribute to the God of the Jews and saying, 'Jehovah has done great things for them,' did they grasp the gladsome reality.

Generally it takes some such extraordinary experience to awaken in us the exalted emotion of a genuine gratitude. So easy is it for us to say 'thanks.' The word slips from our lips with meaningless facility. But for most of us it is only in these rare moments when a child has been happily brought into the world or an achievement for which we have ached and striven has been won or a gift which we have neither earned nor merited has been received or a forgiveness which we have not deserved has been vouchsafed to us that our instinctive thankfulness finds heartfelt utterance. Over a hospital bed a tablet bears these words: 'This bed has been endowed by the savings of a poor man who is grateful for an unexpected recovery.' The sacrifice of thanksgiving!

What an impoverishment we suffer because it takes these unique occasions to call forth a true gratitude. Gratitude should be an emotion that not merely rises to meet unusual circumstances, but a reliable and all-prevailing attitude to life.

See what a difference it would make.

The active spirit of thankfulness would give a new quality to our personal relationships. 'We ought all to make an effort to act on our first thoughts,' says Albert Schweitzer, 'and let our unspoken gratitude find expression. Then there will be more sunshine in the world and more power to make for what is good.' For, when gratitude greets our helpful efforts, it gives fresh stimulus and widens the scope of our service. Whereas, when gratitude is the motive of our action, it conveys a fullness of meaning and shines with a lustre that nothing else can give.

In our social responsibilities too it would make a vast change. It would relax our tensions, adjust our perspectives and enlarge our vision. By and large, men have lost the art of counting their blessings. They have failed to measure the ampler life of our day against the narrower, more restricted and unjust conditions of a past generation. It is less than a lifetime since we knew the rigours of a six-day week and a twelve-hour day and the fury of cut-throat competition. If we appreciated the freer and fuller life that is ours, gratitude would take some of the sting from our discontent, would broaden our horizon and give a new direction to our aspirations.

But how is this sustained spirit of thankfulness possible? Life does not provide us all the time with occasions that stimulate the spirit of praise. On the contrary much of life has to be tackled with grim determination or borne with stern endurance.

The truth is that life is not all of one piece. Think of the pains and deprivations we suffer due to the errors, follies and sins of others. Think of the punishments and rewards which we ourselves have incurred and achieved—the just and inevitable consequences of our own evil and good actions. Life also confers on us blessings with which we have had nothing to do.

And, this is the point, the quality of our life, our fundamental attitude to all we have to bear and

perform is determined by where we place the emphasis. Is it on the first? Then we tend to present a cynical, querulous, resentful attitude to life. If it is the second that we stress, we may become callous and fatalistic or complacent and vain. But, if we put the accent on the third and see life in terms of the mercies we could never win or deserve, then we feel ourselves under an infinite obligation. 'When I look back,' says Schweitzer, 'I am stirred by the thought of the number of people whom I have to thank for what they gave me or for what they were to me.'

This is conspicuously true of the Christian and of his attitude to life. It is he who above all others sees life as a gracious bestowal and who therefore feels there can be no alternative to pouring out his life as a sacrifice of thanksgiving. 'Would you know,' said William Law, 'who is the greatest saint in the world? It is not he who prays most or fasts most; it is not he who gives most alms, or is most eminent for temperance, chastity, or justice; but it is he who is always thankful to God, who receives everything as an instance of God's goodness and has a heart always ready to praise God for it.'

The Christian is thankful to God for all temporal mercies. In this age in which man has won such dazzling achievements in harnessing the resources of Nature to his use, he can be blinded to his final dependence upon the mercy of God. He has studied the soil and knows what is required to fertilize it; he has classified the seed and is aware of what is best to sow; he has invented the harvesters that can cut and bind the grain, and he imagines himself to be well on the way to the mastery. Whereas all he is able to do is but the tiniest fraction of the effort required to produce a harvest. And that effort is God's. He is the great Provider. Whether it is land or houses, bread or motor-cars, ships or television sets, the Christian sees in them, not so much the amazing skill of man, but the wisdom, faithfulness, and goodwill of a kind and beneficent Creator who is the Father of all. Praise Him!

The Christian is thankful to God for spiritual gifts. He can exercise his intelligence, but it was God who gave it to him. He can select the wise from the midst of the foolish and choose the good rather than the bad, but God gave him this discernment and sustains him in his use of it. No gift of which man is prone to boast but finds its origin and the power to employ it in a good, wise, and faithful God. Praise Him!

The Christian is thankful to God for his eternal destiny. His was the design that predestined man for God's eternal fellowship and His was the action that made this plan possible of realization. By the sending of His Son into the world God has done all that is required to fit man for his destiny. Not what man achieves or becomes, however great or good, qualifies him for his place in God's family, but what Jesus Christ has effected. 'In a sense,' says Lesslie Newbigin, 'the Christian has given up the effort to be good. That is no longer his aim. He is seeking to do one thing and one thing only—to pay back something of the unpayable debt of gratitude to Christ who loved him as a sinner and gave Himself for him. And in this new and self-forgetting quest he finds that which—when he sought it directly—was forever bound to elude him—the good life.' In this quest nothing is too hard to attempt and no pain too sore to endure. Any sacrifice demanded is the sacrifice of thanksgiving.

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Living Letters

BY THE REVEREND J. ITHEL JONES, M.A., B.D., LONDON

'You are an open letter about Christ which we ourselves have written, not with pen and ink but with the Spirit of the living God.'—2 Co 3^3 (Phillips).

It is often pointed out that Christ never wrote a book. He is, perhaps, one of the few great teachers who didn't. Plato wrote his *Republic*, Aristotle his *Philosophy*, Muhammad the *Koran*, and Karl Marx *Das Kapital*. Not so Christ. Only once do we have record of Him writing at all, and on that occasion it was in the sand, so that the next gust of wind that came along obliterated the writing. No; Christ's message is not in epistles but in apostles. And the alliterative jingle is no accident. There is a close connexion between the two words and there should be a close connexion between the two things. When Jesus let His message and Kingdom loose upon the world, He did not retire to the seclusion of a monastery to write a *magnum opus*. We are told quite simply that, 'He appointed twelve that they might be with Him and that He might send them forth.'

We have an extension of that idea here. The term 'apostle' in the narrow technical sense is confined to the Twelve. In another sense it may be applied to all who name the Name of Christ. We are 'sent out' (for that is the meaning of the word); we are His apostles and as such become His epistles. 'You are an open letter about Christ.'

That figure, it seems to me, is particularly apposite to-day. We boast that the Bible is a best-seller, but how widely is it read? It is clear, anyhow, that the man in the street does not get his ideas of Christianity from the Bible. For there is an abysmal ignorance concerning the Christian story. It has been reported that during a recent

showing of a film of the life of Christ a woman was heard to ask her husband at the point of the betrayal in the Garden, 'Does He die?' This, we hope, is an extreme case. But others could be quoted to confirm the impression that the Book which God has given to convey His message is not being read.

In such an age, then, our text is more relevant than ever before. People do not read the Book; they read us. This, of course, provided they know that we are Christians. I was astonished to read in a Christian paper some time back a letter from a Christian factory worker saying that he had worked for eighteen months at the same bench with another man whom he had only just found out to be a Christian. (What, by the way, had the writer been doing during those eighteen months?) No doubt some of us need to 'hoist the flag.' But in most cases people know that we are professing Christians, and to us it can be said without qualification, 'You are an open letter about Christ.' What message do we bring to the world concerning Him?

The first word that we bring about Christ is that He is light. In the next chapter to this, where Paul speaks of preaching Christ, he says that 'God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' The question is, of course, how are we to convey to people that 'God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all'? The Scriptural answer would be by 'walking as children of the light and children of the day.' But, of course, the outsider does not know these pious verses. How can we impress upon him that we are walking 'in the light'?

First of all, by making him realize that there is nothing 'shady' in our living. The Christian should show in his very work an integrity and a conscientiousness above the average. We know perfectly well that there are practices indulged in to-day which are regarded generally as harmless, but which, nevertheless, are not one hundred per cent above board. The Christian should have nothing to do with such. Right at the beginning of my ministry, when it fell to my lot to bury a leader of the church to which I ministered, a man who had very big business connexions in that region, I was profoundly moved to hear an outsider as far as the church was concerned say that he had watched this man very carefully in all his undertakings and 'never once,' said the man to me, 'did he let your flag down.'

To walk as children of the light means, again, to know where we are going. There must be an obvious direction to our living. That is something which is completely lacking in the life of the average man to-day. We speak of the 'common round.' A wheel can turn on its own axis and it can also move forward. The Christian's life should be doing both. In contrast to the purposelessness of pagan living to-day, men should see by the Christian that he is 'running with patience the race that is set before him, looking unto Jesus.' Nothing shady; see where you are going. These are the sure signs of 'walking in the light.' And if we are open letters about Christ, this is the way in which we convey the truth that He is light.

Then, of course, we must tell the world that He is love. The message that we bring is that He cares. And that we can only do by caring ourselves. I am not so sure that we are right in saying that Jesus had a passion for souls. What He had was a concern for people. It is true, of course, that Jesus emphasizes the importance of the soul. He set it over against the whole world. But each time He dealt with the whole man. That is what I mean when I say that He had a concern for people and not just a passion for souls. Has the Church been unbalanced in her approach in this matter? In approaching the problem of the soul, does she give the appearance of having isolated it from the whole man? We boast that the movement for social betterment, which has issued in great reforms, derived its original inspiration from the Christian Church. That is no doubt correct. But I doubt whether the Church has always greeted with the enthusiasm she should those reforms which are demanded by the Christian view of man. We must bring to the world the message of the One who loved at infinite cost. That is the meaning of the Cross. And the only way in which we can do that is by ourselves loving and caring until it hurts.

There is no short-cut to this. The only way we can care as Christ cares is to have the love of Christ Himself shed abroad in our hearts. That is what Paul means when he says that we are, 'epistles . . . written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God.' The Holy Spirit is the ink in which the message is written. It is Paul who does the writing, notice. To-day the preacher may be a person, a book, or the greatest Book of all, the Bible. The difference between those hearts in which the writing appears and those in which it does not is the presence of the Holy Spirit. People can come under the same ministry and in some cases be true epistles and in others fail completely. Can people read the writing? If not, it must be because we do not possess the visible ink. Invisible ink may be all very well for secret documents, but when the light and love of Christ are to be placarded before the world, we need the Holy Spirit who is the One who takes of the things of Christ and makes them known.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Perpetual Comfort of Communion

BY THE REVEREND REGINALD E. O. WHITE, M.A., B.D., BIRKENHEAD

'This do ye, as oft . . .'.—1 Co 11[25].

As a congregation quietly gathers before the Table of the Lord a multitude of varied thoughts and feelings take possession of reverent hearts—prayerfulness, thanksgiving, aspiration; regret, contrition, and penitence; a new sense of challenge, of consecration, of re-commissioning; the deep-moving solemnity of the drama of the Cross; memories of the dying Saviour, adoration of the present Lord, a quickening of the advent hope; for some a reminder of new griefs and a whisper of immortality, for others a renewed tenderness of conscience, a fresh promise of victory: these and many other sacred associations are focused in the Communion service, lending an inexhaustible richness to its meaning and giving it peculiar power over our hearts. Yet amid all the values which Communion enshrines for us, the central, the supreme, meaning surely lies within *our Lord's intention*—the special purpose He intended when He said 'This do . . . as oft . . .'. And that is not hard to seek, nor difficult to understand; He meant it for our perpetual comforting.

If that seems at first sight an inadequate statement of our Lord's intention, remember that in its original meaning that word 'comfort' is not an emotional term, but a military one, with echoes in it of the ancient word *fortis*, meaning strong, stout-hearted; and with other military words—fortify, fortitude—for its near relations. To comfort really means 'to increase fortitude' in the heart of another. Jesus was leaving behind Him, as His only legacy to the world, a group of people—people with a new truth in their minds and a great experience in their hearts; but He left no book, no form of words for their direction, no sheltering institution or school to perpetuate His work. He left simply this fellowship of hearts aflame; and for the focal point of that fellowship, a Table and one recurring appointment to meet together—'This do . . . as oft . . .'.

Out into that ancient world He sent them, to live under God's rule in Caesar's empire, to bear witness in Jerusalem, in Judaea, in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth, and to turn the world upside down; and for their need He left them this: Bread, and Wine, and 'This do, in remembrance of me.' This clearly is His intention, that Communion shall ever be the centre to which each returns from his isolation and his loneliness to share fellowship again; a kind of altar—if we may be permitted that metaphor—from whose unquenched flames succeeding generations rekindle their torches and relight their own altar-fires; a spiritual armoury wherein the Christian soul may find his helmet and his shield, his breastplate and his sword, and, hearing afresh the voice of the Captain of Salvation, go forth again to fight the good fight—yes, and a confessional, if we may be allowed a second dangerous metaphor, where the stricken heart may sob out its penitence and find again its peace. Was not *this* our Lord's intention—not just a form of liturgy, or a Christian duty, but an oft-recurring means of renewing grace?

The Christian Eucharist is essentially something that we share together. The more individual elements of Christian life, our individual conversion, private prayers, personal obedience, our lonely battles and our secret aspirations, are all caught up and linked and interwoven with the same things in other hearts. All that this means in comfort, as well as discipline, every practised Christian knows. It does mean discipline, for when our disagreements with others keep us from the Table we know, with an unanswerable inner conviction, that we at least are in the wrong. But it means comfort too: Peter might say 'Though all men forsake, yet will not I'—confident he could stand alone if need be. We know, as he soon did, that we dare not say that. The fellowship of kindred minds is too necessary to our continuance in grace—and so the Lord intended that we oft should come together and strengthen each other's hand in God.

But besides the comfort of renewed companionship we find the deep comfort of something constant and unchanging, the steadying reminder of something once for all accomplished. For each Communion recalls us to that which once *happened*, which stands there, in history, behind us, the constant background of all our lives. For so many of us, the trouble about steadfast continuance in Christian life is our incessant changeableness. We grow older and the enthusiasms of youth simmer down. Life disappoints us, we learn the weakness of our own resolve, the protean forms and resurrection power of our own sins; and many hopes decay. Of course this is not all the story—it were treachery to suggest it: but this is our problem. But

> When in the maddening maze of things
> And tossed by storm and flood
> To one fixed trust our spirit clings—
> We *know* that God is good.

We look out from ourselves to one fixed trust—He loved me, and gave Himself for me. The Redeemer's love, and deed, and unswerving purpose to save confronts me in the Bread and Wine, with the deep strong comfort of His finished work.

It is but the other side of this, to mention the comfort offered in Communion of an unbroken, and unbreakable, Covenant. 'This is the cup of a new covenant, in My blood . . .'. The unfamiliar, age-old word takes us back to days when the written word was rare, and when what mattered in the conduct of human relationships was the oath, and the character of him who swore it. The covenant between men of honour, sanctified by religious language, solemn oath, and holy sacrifice, bound men in mutual loyalty for weal or woe; and thus Moses set forth the bond that bound Israel to her covenant-keeping God. 'Which my covenant they brake,' says Jeremiah, 'But I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel—putting a new spirit within them, forgiving their iniquities, and writing my laws upon their hearts.' 'This cup,' says Jesus, 'is the cup of the New Covenant . . .'—established by the oath of Him who because He could swear by no greater, sware by Himself. And every time we take into our unworthy hands the sacred cup, God is saying to us once more My covenant abides—does yours?

The companionship of friends, the constancy of the Cross, the covenant of grace—such are the ways in which Communion fortifies the soul: but one remains, the soul's secret contact with the Risen, undying, triumphant Lord. For each one of us who truly worships at the Supper of our Lord, the Table becomes the extension through time of our own Damascus Road, where we feel again His touch, His call, His amazing choice of us, and are constrained to answer 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?' Every breaking of bread becomes another walk to Emmaus with a Lord triumphant, understanding, kind, and still commanding. Here lies the Lord's supreme intention: that we keep our tryst with Him; He is Himself the Host, here He has made appointment to meet with us, and promised He shall be known of us in the breaking of bread. In this revitalizing contact with a living Lord lies the deepest, surest comfort of Communion: 'This do,' He said, 'in remembrance *of me*.'

Entre Nous

Edwin Muir

In *One Foot in Eden*, by Edwin Muir (Faber and Faber; 10s. 6d. net), the authentic poet speaks. There are not many modern poets who combine a classical clarity of thought with a classical economy and melody of language as Mr. Muir does.

In 'Prometheus' Mr. Muir thinks of Prometheus, who suffered because he gave gifts to men, picturing the end of all days:

At the world's end to whom shall I tell the story?
A god came down, they say, from another heaven
Not in rebellion but in pity and love,
Was born a son of a woman, lived and died,
And rose again with all the spoils of time
Back to his home, where now they are transmuted
Into bright toys and various frames of glory;
And time itself is there a world of marvels.
If I could find that god, he would hear and answer.

Mr. Muir has that gift of the phrase which stabs and sticks in the memory. He describes Abraham among his contemporaries:

Legendary Abraham,
The old Chaldean wanderer,
First among these peoples came,
Cruising above them like a star
That is in love with distances.

He describes the Incarnation in one swift line:

The marriage feast of heaven and earth.

He strikes to the heart of the enmity of those who crucified Christ:

But the hardened old
And the hard-hearted young, although at odds
From the first morning, cursed him with one curse,
Having prayed for a Rabbi or an armed Messiah
And found the Son of God. What use to them
Was God or a Son of God?

He crystallizes the tragedy of free-will:

It gave the choice without the skill to choose.

He writes of Franz Kafka:

But you, dear Franz, sad champion of the drab
And half, would watch the tell-tale shames drift in
(As if they were troves of treasure) not aloof,
But with a famishing passion quick to grab
Meaning, and read on all the leaves of sin
Eternity's secret script, the saving proof.

Is not that what He did who came to seek and to save that which was lost?

Here is a lovely volume in which a true poet speaks.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.